Steep Goals and Rabbit Holes

Anthony of Boston



Table of Contents

Introduction

Before reading this book, one should understand the perspective I have on the dynamics between conservatism and extremism. I think it's important to surmise the distinction between the two because today there are genuine misconceptions about what defines the conservative ideology. Oftentimes, extremism and conservatism are often intertwined, but I think this is unfair. When Trump became president in 2016, he and all aspects of conservatism had become embedded into the far right extremism that proclaimed to be operating on Trump's behalf. But this was mainly due to the extremist perception that Trump was going to be a change from traditional conservatism, hence why that far right movement referred to themselves as the alternative right, considering themselves outside of the mainstream because of their desire for radical change. But when looking back at history, we can see that the traditional republican/conservative outlook had not been one of change, but more of an inclination to keep whatever was in front of them from undergoing further changes. Donald Trump had always stated, at least since the early 90s, that the United States was changing too fast, and thus why it became his desire to slow down these changes, maybe seeing the advantage of a more predictable American society. However, this outlook had become misconstrued as Trump wanting to turn back the clock and bring America back to a time when segregation was the norm. Regardless of his intention, Trump himself failed to realize that his wild rabble rousing approach diverted from the traditional conservative approach to politics, and gave off the impression that he was in fact an agent of change for the worse and not the better. When the far right extremists had later observed that Trump actually wanted to conserve American society and prevent further changes, they abandoned the Trump movement because they actually want segregation and a return to the 1950s way of life. Hence why many of those who supported Trump during his campaign became strong supporters of the Biden administration because they may believe that Biden is more conducive towards permanently fragmenting the country. Furthermore, when it comes to alternative conservatism of extreme Neo-nazism, the end goal is to bring an end to the post-

Nixon paradigm and either radically transform it into something new, or bring it back to an old segregated era of American history. They believe that assimilation is not possible and that groups will ultimately push for their own advantage at the expense of other demographics. Neo-Nazis and far right extremists will thus support anything that will fragment the country, and there is no way to appease them, except by insulating oneself within his/her own ethnic backdrop. Trump's behavior during his campaign had a huge impact on helping divide the county, which is why many Neo-nazis latched on to his movement, but after they saw that Trump's vision of America was a united one, they distanced themselves from him. And now as of 2023, seeing that Biden is doing nothing to quell ethnic tensions, Neo-nazis are more inclined to support Biden since he seems to be the one most conducive to realizing their ultimate goal of complete separation of races. But moreover, the point I am trying to make is that conservatism has a tendency to want to keep things in place, not rock the boat, and because of this outlook, they should not be put in the same category as people desperate for radical change. If anything, all outlooks for radical change and upheaval, whether far right or far left should all be relegated to the extreme left because extremism can operate both ways. Conservatives, on the other hand, can only want to maintain what they have always known or what is currently in front of them, and of course this can be a virtue or vice, depending on the situation. Many Americans consider the 1980s as the best time the country has ever had, and after Trump was elected, it seemed that he was trying to keep America as close to that timeframe for as long as possible, and others who felt the same saw Trump as the one who could actually do it. The extremists, on the other hand, who had initially supported Trump had the impression that Trump was going to overhaul the current status quo and bring America back to the 1950s. But Trump's more sensible supporters will contend, even relative to the current time we live in, that the 1980s was the best decade of their life and worth conserving. Trump's approach in terms of using reckless speech as a way to try and keep American under that paradigm, however, had many people on edge about what his presidency would entail.

The Black Lives Matter movements exploded toward the end of

the Trump presidency in response to the murder of George Floyd, a victim of police brutality. As a consequence, many countries began to march in solidarity with Black Lives Matter, but were largely unaware of the entire scope and scale of the black situation in the US….the self-perpetuated harboring of violent behavior and the huge disproportion between the number of blacks in this country and their share in contributing to the overall violent homicide rate. There were many videos of looting and unrest, even in the City of Brotherly Love. The unrest was not going to stop anytime soon and blacks felt justified and this justification was being encouraged by many democrats and extreme leftists. One could even gather that some Americans may have been getting a slight kick out of blacks making an animalistic fool of themselves. Since BLM always seemed to devolve into animalism, it became all the more likely that the movement would continue to gain support even from its detractors, just so that such animalism could be on full display for all to see.

After he became president in 2021, Biden tried to do the same thing Trump did by calling for the country to come together in the hopes that moderate politics would make a comeback under his administration. During the last 4 years during Trump's tenure, the democrats tried to balance out the more extreme qualities of Trump, but would find themselves unable to walk back many of the notions that became assigned to their platform. Even BLM—before the wave of protests that occurred near the end of Trump's presidency—was somewhat quiet during much of Trump's administration. One could credit the heavy pressure that the democrats applied on the Trump administration for this. The public posture of urgency by democratic officials did have somewhat of a pacifying effect on minority communities. Some even felt safe enough to support the Trump administration outrightly. Many more even voted for him in the 2020 election compared to the previous one in 2016. The four years of Trump's tenure could have been much worse when one thinks about it. However, many of the attacks that the democrats applied against the Trump administration would have residual effects that would lead the Democratic Party down a deep rabbit hole, of which they could not climb out of.

Chapter 1: Black Lives Matter and the Separatist Rabbit Hole

Back in 2014, in response to multiple incidents of police use of excessive force against unarmed black men in the United States, the "Black Lives Matter" (BLM) movement took to the streets in protest, which oftentimes escalated into full-blown riots. The end result would only end up alienating a large portion of Americans, provoking many of them into supporting then presidential candidate Donald Trump. This was the consequence of not only the violent protests and the name “Black Lives Matter” which gives off the impression that blacks only care about their own best interest and nothing else, but also because the incidents of police brutality was assigned a racial connotation which helped foster a pejorative that these incidents of police brutality was part and parcel of a larger subset of white oppression against African Americans and not the consequence of violent black culture. Such is why words were very important and had the power to change how people feel. Ironically, it wasn't long ago that this 77 percent white nation voted a black guy into office twice. That black guy being Barack Obama.

When it comes to mass movements, any leader who claims to represent a group of people has to become responsible in what he says because his words, from the perspective of a larger community of a different kind, are also believed to be the words of the entire demographic. During this time of social unrest, the extremist elements of society would ultimately latch on to both the Black Lives Matter movement, as well as the Trump movement and set the stage for a massive schism that would permanently alter the social landscape in America. Black Lives Matter had made it clear that they were totally unconcerned about equality. Their only concern was whatever was in their own best interest and that literally forced everyone else to adopt that same perspective. And it didn’t help that the democrats and the extreme left gave BLM the platform to push their ethnocentrism. Only the ignorant would gather that Trump gave rise to “Black Lives Matter.” Anyone who was following what was happening during that time knows better than anyone that “Black Lives Matter” triggered the rise of Donald Trump. No one was manipulated to go to the extreme, but people were willingly closing their eyes to facts that challenged their narrative

and then proceeded to blame someone else when things went haywire. When haven't people known that the media was a business, and that politics was run on donations and lobbying, and even movements like Black Lives Matter sustain themselves on funds contingent on narratives they push? When haven't people known this? At this point, its far too late for people to come to their senses and begin assigning blame to the obvious. When Trump got elected, there was a large window of opportunity for people to become sensible. When Trump disavowed the alt-right and David Duke publicly on numerous occasions, people looked the other way, insisting that he supports them. When Trump unexpectedly put in a word of understanding towards the Black Lives Matter movement, people ignored it and continued to look the other way. "All Lives Matter", remember that? Well, it wasn't until Trump uttered those very words that "All Lives Matter" would come to be considered racist by the left and the democrats. How can that be? The very reason for "All Lives Matter" was to keep "Black Lives Matter" from dividing the country. So much for that. Western society functions efficiently when the different ethnicities are allotted some anonymity and not put on the spot. This was why Jews were able to excel in the 19th century in Europe. Meritocracy and color blindness, which originated from the French Revolution, provided the anonymity required for diverse peoples to function among one another. Bringing attention to race only brings attention to comparative advantage and disadvantage which can further drive division. Initially, Trump tried to push "All Lives Matter" and tried to call the country together, but was not given the honor. In fact, it was the democrats who were the first proponents of "All Lives Matter." It wasn't until Trump uttered the same words that the democrats would ditch the "All Lives Matter" platform. It was blatant contrarianism at its best and now look at the racialized mess the United States is in. Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and Maryland Gov. Martin O'Malley each used the phrase "All Lives Matter" early in their campaign, but would concede to ethnocentric diatribes from groups who were threatening to withdraw their support. Sen. Bernie Sanders, at one of his rallies, had even said, 'Black lives matter, white lives matter, Hispanic lives matter.' But when it came to Trump, the media continued to vilify

him for his “All Lives Matter” stance, even after he publicly disavowed the alt-right and David Duke on numerous occasions. Eventually, though, the democrats would have to try the same thing —reunify the country—in the midst of all this separatism. But since they allowed themselves to go down a rabbit hole, thinking everyone would forget how they advocated separatism and open borders, they now have to manage these two outlooks without alienating their political base. It’s important to note that a divided country is unsustainable in a capitalist country where people have to compete with each other for jobs and resources. Being divided along racial lines just adds fuel to the fire. The two don't mix. This is the new normal that our willingness to go to the extreme has brung us. Now the country has to deal with this. There is no going back to a time in which both negative and positive interactions didn't draw the extreme racist connotation it does now. One can best believe that when they go out and their day is inconvenienced by someone that doesn't represent their racial, cultural background, all of them —right or left—will wonder whether or not race played a role in it. Here is the lesson. Never sabotage your political opposition by destroying the country, all for the sake of pointing the finger at the people in charge. Because, in the event that you come to power, you’ll find yourself left with the impossible task of trying to convince the public that you really don’t advocate for the destructive policies that you once propagated just prior to your ascent. Now the democrats are left holding the bag of racial separatism, open borders, and criminalizing political opposition, trying to figure out a way to walk all of it back. But its sad to say, that they are now stuck with it. The extreme left castigated the ideas of “All Lives Matter,” and “securing the borders” when Trump was in office, and now that they are in power, they are left with these bizarre ideas, both of which their supporters now expect them to uphold. Not to mention, the democrats are pro-war now, which is another rabbit hole they went down as a result of Trump derangement syndrome, believing that Trump was pro-Russian/pro-negotiation and because they don’t support Trump, then they must seek to be anti-Russian, anti-negotiation as a way to distance themselves from Trump. The logic is bizarre.

Race relations were normal under Obama until the end of his

tenure when he failed to rebuke the racist and violent elements of the Black Lives Matter movement. This is a very important lesson for any head of state—never play into the hands of ethnocentrism and over-identify with one's own cultural backdrop. This is what happened late in Obama's tenure when he began to lean towards ethnocentrism. The same can be said for Ukraine, when their ethnic Russian president Viktor Yanucovych sided politically with the Russian side of Ukraine. The result was catastrophic. Because Obama did similar by fostering and encouraging the Black Lives Matter movement when he should have in fact castigated it immediately, Trump cannot be said to be the cause of the racial problems in this country. African American leaders, celebrities, and athletes making every single thing under the sun about race was the problem and Trump leaving office did not make that go away. One can call out racism when its there, but calling it out on every single instance of human existence was just silly to everyone. Racism is never cool no matter who does it, but there are too many double standards regarding this issue. Actually, the double standards were more of a problem than the racist opinions were. Whether you're strict or lenient regarding racist opinions...that doesn't matter....its the neglect of applied fairness regarding how those opinions were dealt with that seemed to be the problem. Hopefully, we start seeing some equilibrium soon or at least an attempt. Otherwise, this would reach a breaking point that would more than likely bring us back to segregation, and don't for one second believe it cannot happen. Actually, most people probably believe that it cannot happen, which makes it all the more likely a real possibility.

Sure it is possible that Obama may have been encouraged to lend a bit too much support to Black Lives Matter than he would have liked. Obama had veered away from any overt ethnocentricity for most of his tenure. When that BLM movement first started, much of the rhetoric that came from it was not just a polemic that singled out white police, but also one that blamed whites all over the country. I remember when it first started, even democrats were taken aback by it which was why many of them also supported the "All Lives Matter" platform initially. This gave Trump a platform for people to unite around around, but of course the democrats begin to call "All Lives Matter" a racist concept. Of course, police brutality

was certainly an issue, but the racial connotation it was given at that time was bit excessive. This alienated alot of Americans from black people over time. Obviously, there needed to be something peaceful to address police brutality in general. Unfortunately, all there was for that was an ethnocentric movement. As a result of that, one can say that racism does exist now, but of course it would if one fosters it long enough. The second wave of BLM madness in the summer of 2020 and with many of the same fringe elements....looting vandalism etc, the division of the country had become pretty much complete. The violent separatists of all types would end up supporting BLM, making it to where blacks have no choice but to fall in line. This supports the cause of all separatists, and that's unfortunate because we are in a different paradigm now. Blacks can no longer be pro-American even if they wanted to, and they have no choice but to own their blackness if they want to be a protected class, protected by the democrats. The democratic support that the BLM movement gained when Trump was in office—in my opinion at that time—was in response to some risky foreign policy moves by his administration. NK, Iran, etc. I was under the impression that the left was anti-war and could not stomach the potential of another war on foreign soil on possibly false pretenses. So I presumed the obvious response on the part of the democrats was to keep America focused on domestic issues.....creating some if necessary. But after Biden's election, we saw that this was not the case when they appeared to foster mayhem both at home and abroad, propagating Critical race Theory and war with Russia.

The demographic problems the US faces at the moment began during Obama's last term. Police brutality was rampant during his administration, especially throughout his second term, but magically he was not assigned blame for any of it. The public was made to believe in the last years of his presidency and up unto now, that any criticism of Obama is essentially racist. This political climate left no room for dilenating in terms of pointing out Obama critics that were not racist and Obama critics that were. This is an ongoing issue for blacks with status or power—they have a tendency to play the race card when under scrutiny, but yet downplay the aspect of race when they are not. This will ultimately leave America's base to conclude that assimilation is just untenable.

Even black conservatives like Clarence Thomas would downplay race when not facing any backlash, but would immediately play the race card when having to face public scrutiny. He was under scrutiny was in 1991 when he was accused of sexual harassment, and he immediately compared it to a modern day lynching and still has a vendetta against white liberals. This was what astounds me about black conservatives. They initially get into that political ideology of not getting trapped in victim-hood and tell others to not play the victim card, but would play the race/victim card themselves when it suits them. Talk about hypocrisy. Black conservatives don't realize the damage they cause when they do this. They kill their own credibility as a conservative assimilated member of society and eliminate the possibility of ethnocentrism ever dying. Bottom line is that in many cases, blacks, no matter their perspective, would pull out the race card when its convenient for them and downplay it when it isn't. Clarence Thomas, Michael Jackson, OJ Simpson all at one point insisted that race was not a factor, that was, until the adversity of public scrutiny came about.

Don Lemon, an anchor at CNN, said "We have to stop demonizing people and realize the biggest terror threat in this country is white men, most of them radicalized to the right, and we have to start doing something about them." That's not even in comparison with what Trump said about banning a religious group....if that's a rebuttal that Don Lemon was trying to make with that statement. To my knowledge, Trump never openly called for the banning of Arabs, Hispanics, blacks, Mexicans, as an ethnic group. He called for the banning of all Muslims, which was wrong and easily interpreted as a racial statement since most Muslims were understood to be Arab. But still, as I take into context what Lemon said, the words expressed by Trump was directed to Muslims, which was not an ethnic group. Don Lemon's words were aimed directly to an ethnic group. He just possibly alienated all the liberal white help needed to make this diverse America work efficiently. If he was trying make a point in contrast to the offensiveness of what Trump said, he would have ignorantly stated that all Christians should be considered the biggest terror threat. At least most people would have understood the point he was trying to make. These types of behaviors being normalized in the

mainstream information channels is one of many examples of what could bring America to civil war.

Biden also castigated whites, saying whites were the biggest threat to the nation. At least in the case of Biden, it was an example of his application of self-awareness and self-depreciation because he himself is white. However, if people look back at history, Stalin, being Russian himself, used this conciliatory approach towards the non-Russian peoples in the Soviet Union, often pointing to Russian nationalism as the real threat to the Soviet Union. If you read Stalin's early speeches as General Secretary, you would see that he was constantly pointing the finger at Russian nationalism to be the real threat. But what happened? This approach by Stalin actually led many non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union, such as the Ukrainians, to believe that Stalin was giving the non Russian peoples of the Soviet Union the green light to assert their own extreme nationalist identity and separatism, which was actually the opposite effect of what Stalin intended his conciliatory approach to garner. And ironically, it was Stalin himself that ultimately carried out the crackdown on the non-Russian nationalism when his conciliatory approach didn't work, and then he followed up his atrocities by actually pushing Russian nationalism in the Soviet Union. Huge irony there, but this could play out in real time analogously with the US, whereby democrats applying a great deal of conciliatory effort towards non-whites in the US, but later finding out that people are exploiting it, may themselves feel compelled to launch a massive crackdown on separatism. Biden applying the conciliatory self-depreciating approach when it comes to his own demographic, much like Stalin, could be seen by non-white Americans as the green light for non-white demographics to assert separatism and nationalism, which would ultimately do nothing but trigger more white nationalism, the total opposite of what Biden was intending. The democrats may find that they themselves would be the ones having to crack down on non-white nationalism/extremism. Not long ago, the FBI raided a black socialist solidarity group for having ties to the Russian government. The Democrats want to put the onus on one race, but learning from history, every demographic has to do their part to keep their own extremist elements in check. Don't get me wrong, its great that

Biden wants to keep white nationalism in check, but in my opinion, its counter intuitive to think that allowing other demographics to assert nationalism and extremism would solve the problem. In all inevitability, it would only make the problem worse.

The US is now in a new paradigm of multi-culturalism, thanks largely in part to the machinations of the extreme left and the constant complaining from ethnocentric groups. While the previous epoch of the USA was aimed at getting Americans not to see each other as fundamentally different, this new paradigm is attempting to get America to tolerate and even celebrate the differences among its diverse population. The drawback to this is that it could trigger territorialism, but time will tell. The first step in society's preparation for multiculturalism is preparation for honest self-evaluation and honest other-evaluation. Almost every time an objective discourse on racial differences had been presented, the presenter was often passed off by listeners as biased. However, in this new paradigm, the country cannot move forward until objective recognition of self and other takes on a more prominent role. It's easy to acknowledge when someone has a comparative advantage, but very difficult to acknowledge when that comparative advantage was a result of excellence and not a result of discrimination. The good news is that all people have something to offer, just as they also have something to take away. Instead of solely focusing on accommodating a group of people into an industry in which the accommodating collective body already have a comparative advantage over other groups of people not only in numbers, but also in general performance, it would seem even more wise if that collective body uses aspects of that particular comparative advantage to create a different industry for another group of people to expand upon activities in which they could exert a comparative advantage. Basically, the gist of it is that both groups get to maintain its grip on an industry which serves their prospective communities without stepping on each other's toes or invading each other's space. Another key element that plays into the functionality of this scenario is that people, as a whole, excel in things because they naturally value them and not so much because they are superior. The superiority occurs in how the activity is valued by a group of people as a whole. All individuals can rise

above their stations, however, groups of people cannot as their identities and all the values that come with are embedded to varying degrees into their group conscious framework. The British don't produce enough food to feed themselves, but because of their excellence in management, finance, and manufacturing, they are able to use the resources from those industries to provide enough food for themselves through international trade. They are a clear example of why you don't have to engage in every industry in order to gain resources from other industries. The key ingredient for multiple cultures coexisting is the allowance for each culture to sustain itself by expanding in industries in which they have a comparative advantage, and not only that, but also expanding the opportunities within the industry to allow for more of their phenotype to engage in activity in which they excel at. African Americans often sulk at their lack of representation in many fields of industry, but often overlook the comparative advantage and influence they had have in sports, music and dancing all while only making up 12 percent of the population. Does this mean that other genetic phenotypes aren't capable of bringing to the table what African Americans bring to the table when it comes to sport? (And by sport, I mean the part of it that requires physical exertion and not the management part which was classified as a comparative advantage for the European American) No. It just means that their community doesn't value excellence in this area in the way that blacks in America do and therefore partake less in the activity than African Americans do. Basketball had become a global industry that had provided career avenues and jobs for millions around the world. Excellence in this area had opened the door for African Americans to join industries in which they, as a whole, do not place considerable effort into, much in the same way the British use the resources from banking, management, and manufacturing to get food for themselves while not placing considerable effort into producing it for themselves. Jews, who make up 1 percent of the population in the USA, were able to sustain themselves as a race through efforts in academia, teaching, and advising. Because of their excellence in these areas, they were able to make their way into other industries and provide more resources for sustaining their communities. And European Americans, whom make up the

majority of the population in the United States, play the most crucial role in allowing for multiple cultures to co-exist within a society while exerting a comparative advantage in their valued industry. The European American's excellence in management, foresight, patience, planning and long-term strategic thinking is what provides the platform for this diversity to function because it provides infrastructure.

Speaking in this manner is extremely uncomfortable and will only accentuate people perceiving their negative and positive interactions through a racial lens, which will only lead towards territorialism which is a precursor to war. Yet the left and the democrats insist on keeping the country fragmented in terms of race and want to prioritize public discourse about race. There will obviously be residual effects as a result. The old paradigm between Nixon and Obama's first term was the attempt to depriortizie race in the public sphere, allowing the individual room to reach the top. But now under this democrat construct, race has to be the priority, which in my opinion will only lead to territorialism and the end of the United States as we know it. The democrats insist on teach Critical Race Theory (CRT) in schools, which will only further highlight the differences of the diverse peoples living in the United States. If anything, it should be CBT (Cognitive Behavioral Therapy) that is taught in schools because much of America's growing fragmentation is occurring within the immediate environment, where people are viewing every interaction through a racial lens. Cognitive Behavioral Therapy teaches that interactions don't have to be judged from one perspective. If the any entity wants to counter CRT, they can do this by proposing that CBT be taught in schools, which would help circumvent the widespread racialized perception of positive and negative interactions. An example of CBT's effect is in the way a person can choose to either view a rude cashier's behavior towards them as being racially motivated or simply based on him or her having a bad day. CBT would teach to students to look at every interaction/situation from multiple angles before making a judgment. CRT, on the other hand, would cause students to only see everything through the prism of race. Granted, there are instances of racism, but applying that outlook to every aspect of life is highly destructive. CBT would prevent that from

happening.

Ben Carson, the current secretary of Housing and Urban Development(HUD), recently made a statement about slaves that drew quite a bit of backlash. While giving a speech, and talking about immigration, he made reference to African slaves that were brought to this country on slave ships by describing them as immigrants who came here in the hopes of having a better life and being willing to work harder and longer to achieve that goal. Historical record informs us that Africans in captivity were brought to the U.S. by way of trade between their West African captors and European American merchants. The journey could hardly be considered voluntary in terms of the manner of which that would fall under the official definition of "immigrant," ...at least to my understanding. Of course he could have meant it figuratively, but in politics, the status quo deems that words were never to be left open to public interpretation. So to avoid confusion, the norm is for public officials to remain literal in every sense, and if they have to digress from that, at least clarify what was meant by statements made in a figurative sense. Speech had not been a strong point for Ben Carson. Even running against another candidate in Donald Trump whose choice of words were very controversial, Ben Carson ended up being more scrutinized which caused him to lose his position in the polls and eventually drop out of the GOP Presidential race. Ironically, his speaking and clarification on behalf of Donald Trump's words and actions played a major role in Trump getting elected. The key to understanding Ben Carson was not looking at him as a man of words, but as a man of action, which is a staple of Tea Party politics. Bannon, Carson, and the rest of the Tea Party representatives currently in the White House were not looking to make a point. They were looking to drastically alter the system or current establishment. Drain the swamp...if you will.

Republicans, while accused of being the party of racism, has a track record of putting forth legislation aimed at incorporating African Americans into the mainstream American framework. Abraham Lincoln, the president who ended slavery in the south, was a republican. Richard Nixon, another republican, is an overlooked hero of civil rights. While laws were passed to establish civil rights before Nixon's term, it was his actions during his term

that really solidified the rights of African Americans. He doesn't get the credit he deserves because of the way he went about doing it. It was so objective and strategic that paying attention the methodology sort of takes away from any sense of triumph that would come from the end result. Nixon pushed for civil rights as a way to do the right thing, but at the same time held back on civil rights as a way to get re-elected. He zig-zaged and zig-zaged and before you knew it, all schools in the south were desegregated without a drop of blood and not only that, he was able to maintain the votes of the white southerners who deeply opposed desegregation and get elected for a second term. It was the greatest political feat in history. Nixon's re-election opened the door for all politicians to take up the cause of minorities without fear of losing votes. Many of the policies and laws passed during his administration served as the foundation of what made America Great. Everyone loves Reagan. But without Nixon, the 80's, as it was, would have never been. It was Nixon who ended the draft, leaving parents able to sleep soundly at night knowing their children would not have to fight in a war they chose not to. It was Nixon who got America off the Breton Woods gold standard and into a floating exchange rate which led to the credit expansion that allowed for the technology boom of the 80's and 90's as banks were able to lend more. It was Nixon who established the right for Native Americans to control their own tribal affairs. It was Nixon who fought for equal employment opportunity for Blacks and desegregated schools in the south. It was Nixon who ended the Vietnam War with some semblance of honor. It was Nixon who established positive trade relations with Russia and China. Sure Nixon said some questionable things in private, but let his actions speak for itself.

Chapter 2: Radical Islam and the Trump Movement

In retrospect, during Trump's campaign when radical Islam was a hot button issue, many felt that Trump's rhetoric would put a dent in the efforts of the government to de-radicalize, through diplomacy, potential Islamic extremist that was already brewing in the country. The conciliatory effect is a huge key to fighting terrorism. The reckless rhetoric of Trump, however, was considered the biggest danger of a Trump presidency. Many of Trump's supporters, nonetheless, felt that the reckless rhetoric was not an issue of paramount importance, and that other issues like the economy was of a higher priority and of which would be something that Trump could move in a positive direction. Others, however, didn't think a good economy was worth having to deal with an increase in sporadic terrorist attacks on American soil on the scale of what happened in Paris, Brussels, and Nice when Islamic radicals launched terror attacks against innocent civilians. But of course one can try to say as a rebuttal to the latter outlook, "Oh we were already experiencing it, how much worse can it get?" Well, it could have actually gotten much worse........to the point where it would leave our government with no choice but to handle the situation in a systematic and cold manner......a style that had morally, from a religious standpoint, tarnished the nation's past. Many people felt that this scenario of potentially triggering Islamic extremism via reckless rhetoric was much better than the scenario of a major conflict with Russia......which was felt, by many, would come with a Hillary presidency. However, one must surmise how the dynamics of the relationship between Trump and Putin would change when Trump became president. They may have been on good terms during his campaign, but when Trump became president and decided to further provoke Russia by pulling out of a Cold War era nuclear treaty and sending heavy weapons to Ukraine in 2017, Putin would end up losing faith in resolving his concerns about NATO expansion and US aggression, and thus decide to invade Ukraine.

Radical Islamic extremism was spreading throughout Europe as well. The London mayor, in the aftermath of the London terror attacks in 2017, mentioned that terror attacks were something that

the citizens of London should get use to. He was right in the sense that terror attacks were a part of human existence, however, it would be very difficult to get use to the fact that terror attacks occur in places or against targets in which the perpetrator was familiar. And now with cultures becoming more and more diverse, the aspect of someone with a different ethnicity being upset with the establishment and taking out his frustration through bombings, shootings, or vehicular homicide would be difficult for natives of that culture to get use to....... especially when there was antipathy coming from the people who represent the same ethnicity of the perpetrator, even if it was off in the distance. Ever heard of the saying, familiarity breeds contempt? Well that concept was the reason that racialist like David Duke, Malcolm X, and Louis Farrakhan would always be relevant. Terror from different ethnic groups arising from their familiarity and contempt with a certain culture(even their own) was the reason why all of a sudden everything preached by these figures I mentioned goes from being gibberish to being gospel. The anger of a terrorist cannot acknowledge that even though he may have grown up in certain surroundings as a different ethnicity, the fact of he being who he was, ethnically, would often be taken as a subset rather than as an outlier. This was where integration of multiple cultures poses a problem. With terrorism and anger at the establishment being a part of existence, integration and perpetrators of terrorism from a different ethnic background leads society back to segregation, but in a very violent manner.

Radical Islam was not the crux of the terrorism problem in the United States. The United States faces an issue that goes far beyond immigration and one that had been in motion and on the rise since April 20, 1999. The terrorist attacks that had occurred in America had not been so much the result of influence from radical Islam, as it was from the result of frustration that arises in men for not being able to consummate relationships with women. Even in regards to 9/11, only one of the hijackers was documented to be married. The rest were single men, probably celibate as well. This is a universal problem that would continue to grow if not addressed. Radical Islam or any political or religious outlook for that matter is oftentimes just a mask that the perpetrator wears in order to avoid

the shame of having to admit that his failure with women was part of the reason for his homicidal anger. I say "part" because another factor involved was the fact that women, especially younger women, tend to gravitate toward the very type of men who had socially tormented the emotionally/romantically frustrated loner for as long he can remember. So in essence, her acceptance of this character was considered a form of betrayal and a reality of human nature that was too much for the frustrated loner to cope with. It was beyond unacceptable to him. This was the actual spark of that mass-murder homicidal mindset. It became a mind that was open to anger and destruction and couple that with the age of unfiltered information and you have full blown schizophrenic madman capable of harming anything that moves. It was not just the failure with women that sends them over the edge. That was just the spark. What sends him over the edge is woman's natural gravitation toward men, whom in the mind of the perpetrator, had made his life miserable through their poor social behavior towards him.

The problem with social behavior in the form of communication is that it is interpersonal, making it hard to really pinpoint when its a problem. Everyone is so focused on when someone is racist or when someone is angry or someone is gay or lazy. But when someone is an asshole, it just doesn't seem to be a cause for worry. Why? Because it usually only affects one person, the guy being addressed by this anti-social personality. It leaves the individual with the full responsibility of managing his reaction to this verbal attack, which oftentimes occurs for no particular reason. There has to be a form of stigmatization toward the antisocial personality who tramples over the psychological well-being and resources of others. As far as I know, there isn't one other than "asshole" or "bully", but those are more of a slang terminology with very little social ramifications behind it. Such a character needs a stigma assigned to him, which holds weight. One cannot call them mentally ill because they don't display behaviors that are associated with people who were mentally ill. The only way is for the psychologist to intervene and acknowledge and make clear though terminology that this "asshole" behavior is part of a personality disorder. This would be a deterrence because no one likes to walk around with a disorder attached to their name. Now,

when this character acts out, he may faces stigmatization, which is a form of public humiliation and thus a deterrent to letting himself go socially.

Chapter 3: The Democrats Enter the Rabbit Hole

During Trump's 2016 campaign, it seemed like Trump was not trying to win the election and in many instances it seemed too obvious, such as when he bragged that he could still win support even if he brandished a gun and began shooting people on a busy street in New York. Trump's outrageous performing during his campaign would end up alienating much of the GOP because his behavior was not what presidents like Ronald Reagan and Richard Nixon stood for. Trump was such a poor representation of the traditional conservative archetype, and his attitude and lack of restraint up unto the 2016 election could have been intentional and probably had something to do with feelings of betrayal due to the GOP's lack of support during his campaign, which could have been used as justification for Trump to try and take the party down with him, that is, if he was indeed trying to lose the election on purpose. Trump's antics during his campaign led to accusations that he was another Hitler. However, in the event that anyone would try to argue such an extreme postulate, the biggest difference between Hitler and Trump in terms of power was that Hitler had a party that supported his individual values, not only behind him but with a majority of seats in the German government before he even came to power. Trump had neither one of those in his favor. Trump would have the support of the people, but no allies once he would get in office. Therefore, almost everything he proposes as president would more than likely be shot down by Congress. If Trump knew he would receive the support he was receiving as of his 2016 presidential campaign….. years ago, he would have started his own party and worked on establishing it in the House and the Senate before a presidential run. It would be then…. that Trump could wield power like a dictator. But it could only happen if he established a party that backed up his own values. In any case, especially when it came to preventing the nation from falling apart, it was important that those who were against Donald Trump not fall into the trap of letting their desire to be right about him get in the way of actually wanting him to do a good job. The Democratic Party's desire to be right about Trump was essentially what defined the Trump administration—any good or positive thing that Trump

did would either only be subverted or discredited. There were times when the media would not give Trump credit when he did engage in good statesmanship, such as when Trump openly disavowed the KKK and alt-right groups to the dismay of its leaders. Initially, even in the worst of his rhetoric, Trump never mentioned anything close to the premise that Americans should divide themselves on the basis of race. The division that Trump called for was a division that had to do with America being America and the rest of the world being the rest of the world. From a global standpoint, yes, Trump was divisive....but this can be a good or bad thing depending on how you feel about the sovereignty of the country you live in. Trump also disavowed David Duke, a former grand wizard of the Ku Klux Klan.

While David Duke is controversial, its hard to place him into the historical framework of the KKK's violent past. He actually attempted to remove the element of violence from the white nationalist agenda, which alienated him from the more radical members of the KKK. His idea was to use non-violent means to address European-American issues, an antithetical approach to the traditional revolutionary model used by the KKK. In the more recent past, his tone had changed into a more Anti-Zionist perspective. This issue was where the democrats showed a lot of ignorance early during the Trump administration. They repeatedly charged Trump with being allies with David Duke, all while ignoring the 40 or so times Trump disavowed David Duke and the alt-right. There's video of Trump repeatedly disavowing them. There was also Trump's obvious pro-Israel agenda—which was a complete and unforgivable U-turn from the contemporary ideologies of white nationalism—didn't sway the left in backing off on the Trump/White Nationalist collusion accusations. Trump even extended his hand to BLM after the Dallas mass shooting, of which five police officers were killed by a deranged black nationalist. Not to mention, Trump also hired blacks to his cabinet. I don’t think Hitler hired any Jews to be part of his cabinet. So there goes that comparison.

When it comes to race, many were upset about Donald Trump's original response to the Charlottesville tragedy for which he called for both sides to stop the violence and division without immediately condemning Alt-Right as racist and violent (something he had done,

and on multiple occasions in the past), and thus leaving the impression that he somehow favors these groups. However, when one backtracks to the incident in Dallas in which an African American man named Micah Johnson, who was deeply influenced by the Black Lives Matter movement, planned and carried out a sniper attack on 12 police officers (5 of them killed), Donald Trump took on a similar tone, immediately after, to the one he was being criticized for. He doesn't condemn Black Lives Matter following the incident. He had in the past and would again in the future. But following this particular incident in a statement, instead of castigating BLM, he gives a word of understanding by mentioning some of the victims of Police Brutality, and the need for something to be done about it. He mentions the deaths of Alton Sterling in Louisiana and Philando Castile in Minnesota and says "how much work we have to do in order to make every American feel that their safety is protected." Then he calls for love and unity. Everything he said immediately after the the Charlottesville tragedy was consistent with how he responds to any racially charged violence. The logic being used against him to indicate that he was a supporter of Alt-Right for not immediately criticizing them would also have to be used to indicate that he was a supporter of Black Lives Matter for not immediately calling them out for their role in inciting violence. Trump, however, would eventually end his 4-year term decidedly pro-white—much of the country had been provoked into ethnocentrism for that matter. But he did not start out that way publicly. Early on, his distinction between himself and the rest of the world was strictly kept to how nationality was defined within geographical borders—not how its defined in terms of ethnicity.

Chapter 4: Trump and the Russia Collusion lie

In addition to being initially accused of colluding with/supporting the KKK, Trump was also falsely accused of colluding with the Russian government as an asset in the Kremlin's attempt to interfere in the 2016 election. While Russia was certainly involved in election interference, it turned out that there was no evidence implicating Donald Trump as having any involvement. Special Counsel Robert Muller headed up an investigation into Trump's ties to the Russian government, but would find nothing that could lead to an indictment. The FBI's infiltratration of Trump's 2016 campaign, however, led to another investigation because the FBI was not suppose to intentionally do anything related to trying to alter the outcome of an election. However, its hard to argue what someone's intention was. Even if Obama put the FBI up to it, how does one argue that it was Obama's intention to affect the election when he was Commander and Chief at the time and the issue with Russia ties to the Trump campaign was related to national security. Russia was not a friend to the US and diplomatic chicanery on their part was always a red flag for textbook espionage...not something anyone should take lightly. Regardless, after it was found that there were no ties between Trump and Russian operatives, Special Counsel John Durham led an investigation to figure out if there was criminal intent on the part of the FBI or other government officials to falsely tie Trump to Russian government election interference for the purpose of influencing the election and preventing Donald Trump from becoming president. While Durham's investigation did not find any evidence of nefarious intent by law enforcement officials, he did conclude that there was confirmation bias applied by the FBI regarding accusations of Trump's ties to the Russian government. What is very alarming about any investigation is confirmation bias. We all suffer from it, somewhat, when we have a strong hunch about something or believe we are onto something. I know I do. However, government agencies have the power to confirm what they believe and if emotions get involved or things get heated as a result of hostile opposition, it can make it difficult for them to keep a non-biased approach. I do believe with Russia, because Russia poses such a threat, investigators were really trying

to be thorough in the investigation of Trump/Russia ties and were looking fully into any and all activity that could be remotely related to Russia. While Trump was clear of any wrongdoing when it came to Russian meddling, his associates were the ones whose interactions were coming off as suspicious in this regard.

Chapter 5: Democrats enter the Open Borders Rabbit Hole

Leading up to the election, there were rare times when Trump seemed to actually care about the safety of his supporters, as he became more aware that his words not only had a negative effect on those who oppose him, but also and moreover, a negative effect on his supporters. It seemed he was somewhat ready to clean up his rhetoric. Him becoming more aware of what he was saying, when he was saying it and how it would affect people was a very good sign anytime it occurred prior to the election. It takes discipline to chose one's words wisely, but it was imperative for a President. All candidates carry some sort of negative disposition, and Trump may never have perfect statesmanship, but the fact that he was starting to show a willingness as election day was getting closer was so huge and a good thing for everyone because lets face it, he could be good for the country in many ways, like negotiating and economics. But reckless speech can cause so much chaos.

After the election between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton ended in a victory for Donald Trump by way of electoral vote, it was hard not to sense the mixed condition within the smoke of the public's reaction to it. Just walking around in public, one could feel the varying degrees of shock, quiet exhilaration, and worry affecting everyone within their space, all at the same time. At the outset of the aftermath of the election, there was a status quotient—you could be open about your support for Hillary, but had to be quiet about any support for Donald Trump. As time passed and the public was beginning to resign to the reality of a Donald Trump presidency, a new perspective would began to come into play, one which didn't involve putting aside the old attitude toward President Donald Trump (which was one of contempt from those who supported Hillary Clinton and one of optimism from those who supported Donald Trump) but embracing a new attitude that encompasses all the qualities of a President and judges fairly according to that metric. Many in the public sphere, like NBA analyst Charles Barkley, who was not a fan of Donald Trump, still warned that it was important to wait and see how Trump manages policy before drawing conclusions. Advice regarding a "wait and see" approach was largely ignored by the left-leaning media and

many liberals. Right after the election, protests broke out, as well as death threats aimed at Donald Trump, many of them coming from famous celebrities.

But if we would have taken everything into context, we could have been able to paint a clear picture of what Donald Trump would bring to the table. As it applies to everyone, there would be some bad but also some good. Throughout the campaign in 2016, in the public's observance of the words and actions of Donald Trump, many notions about him came to light. One of the earliest was that he was a racist, which was extrapolated mainly from two incomplete and controversial quotes of his. The first was, "Ban all Muslims," and the second was "Build a Wall." Now before one can elaborate, one must first to try and define what exactly is a racist, which is not easy because there are varying degrees as almost everyone has some reservations, both good and bad, about people of a different ethnicity. The typical definition is someone who actively discriminates against a large group of people, as opposed to individuals, on the basis of DNA, i.e. skin color, eyes, hair texture, etc. There were sources which indicate that Trump had done this form of discrimination at least once in his life when it came to who he preferred residing on his real estate properties, but there were also sources that show he's done just the opposite—engage in behavior that catered to minority groups. Does it cancel out? However, judging from one's own eyes by watching his campaign, Trump's terminology can be argued as racist since many Muslims, the religion of those he wants to ban (until something was figured out with regards to terrorism as Trump stated directly after) were of Middle Eastern descent. Mexico, the country that he wants to build a wall around, was made up of Hispanics. However, with that argument of racism, his words should also be interpreted, as a counter-argument, to be excessively nationalistic when coming from the angle of him not expressing the desire to also exile the Hispanics and Muslims that were here legally, many of whom were employed by Donald Trump. It could be ascertained that from his campaign, in his verbal attacks, it was more fair, at that moment to take him as excessively nationalistic and traditionalistic because the targets of those attacks were subjects outside of the borders of the country or in the U.S. illegally—illegally being something which

had to be considered a legitimate issue because the US is theoretically a nation of laws. However, to the credit of the left, the US could not afford to send a message of animosity to those who were here illegally. So as a way to circumvent the offensiveness taken by Trump's wording used to describe his desire to tackle illegal immigration, Trump's opposition would take on a more than usual accommodating attitude towards illegals in order to reduce overall hostility arising from interpretation of Trump's words. It makes up for the lack of diplomacy, in a way at least. But moreover, can Trump's geographical nationalism be labeled as racism? Just like "angry" cannot be placed on the level with "murderer," or "competitiveness" placed on the level with "jealousy," or "free thinker" with "mentally ill" even though a devolving process can take place and lead to the more unfavorable aspects of those qualities, Nationalism and Traditionalism on the basis of country, and not ethnicity cannot be rushed to judgment of being on the level of "racist." Trump in his repeated expression of "Make American Great Again," and his discontent, as it pertains to other countries and nations, shows a man that sees this country as becoming something unfamiliar to him. His campaign showed him to be an extreme traditionalist that wants to preserve what he knew as America or basically a certain status quo. Only someone who had lived during the 80's and 90's when America truly was great can understand Trump's nostalgia. Even if one was alarmed at his verbal expression and lack of diplomacy, one can still acknowledge the the winning attitude, the optimism, the longing for the the good ole days as qualities of Trump that were worthy of being used to measure his lack of diplomacy against, even if just for the sake of being fair. There is good and bad to everything, just as there was something to lose and something to gain in everything. As long as there was a measure of solidarity within Trump's working environment, one should always have felt hopeful that Trump in his weak points won't allow a devolvement, but muster up whatever he can in the way of evolvement, even if just by small increments. However, during his tenure, President Trump would find himself being betrayed by the people closest to him, which had a way of triggering a display of his more ominous qualities.

Trump was also accused of being misogynist, especially when

evidence was revealed that years prior to his election, he was bragging about his sexual exploits and the ability to get away with groping women while he was still married. This information came out during his campaign and was a driving factor behind the disbelief that many had that he could still get elected. America had always struggled with misogyny, as patriarchy has been seen as a given when it comes to discourse about politics, whereby many don't make much of an issue about it. But in regards to this controversy, misogyny in the US was on full display, as it had no bearing on Trump's growing popularity. Because the US has yet to have a woman president, many feminists believe that this country cannot be considered the paragon of progressiveness. In retrospect, the first feminist wave, the women's suffrage movement ran concurrent with abolitionist movement in 1830s, but was ultimately abandoned because when it came to African Americans, white men at that time still preferred to stay in line with the patriarchal framework by prioritizing the rights of men over women. Thus why the 15th amendment provided suffrage to black men, as opposed to everyone. Black men got the right to vote before white women. The women's suffrage movement ultimately wanted suffrage for everyone, and later became resentful that the voting rights of negro men were prioritized over theirs'.

In hindsight, when it came to immigration, the democrats were not careful in opposing Trump's stance on securing the borders and ultimately made a huge strategic mistake when Trump was in office. Because of Trump's reckless rhetoric about immigration, the democrats tried to distance themselves from him by flirting with the idea of open borders, which gave off the impression that when they—the democrats—would take office, border crossing restrictions would be laxed and everyone would be able to come right in. When Biden entered office in 2021, unsurprisingly, the democrats had trouble walking back those notions and ended up facing a disaster at the border. What the democrats should have done during the Trump administration was advocate for strong border security, but without the harsh offensive rhetoric that Trump was employing. This would have kept people from getting the wrong impression about what the democrats' goals were as far as immigration. Ultimately, the media, the democrats, and the

public made a huge mistake by not taking a more moderate approach into how they respond to the Trump administration. In trying to mitigate the damage possibly arising from how the rhetoric of Trump could be comprehended, many on the left felt obligated to espouse a different message by taking a stance against certain policies. Now, there was no exit strategy on the part of the left to back off from these manifested political views. This left one to rightly assume that open borders with un-checked immigration was what was being meant by all of the protest and polemics coming from the left against the Trump administration. It seems it would have made more sense for the democrats to try and play down and even eliminate some of the newer ideas that made its way into the democratic platform…ie socialism, communism, open borders, and even anti-white male rhetoric. It would have been important for the democrats to do this while Trump was still in office, and not after he left. The Democrats may have never intended for their adversarial stance to Trump and the rhetoric that came with it to lead to giving off an impression of supporting these things, but its very difficult to slow down emotionally charged momentum by taking a step back to make an astute observation about something that doesn't seem quite right.

The biggest threat to major upheaval in the US was and still is immigration. A major civil war took place in the United States in the 1860's as a result of a similar dynamic. Remember, most people in the south didn't own slaves, nor had any say on the matter. One needed to be wealthy to own slaves. The attitude at that time was that since the government was responsible for bringing slaves there, the government should be responsible for bringing them back, not dump them on their communities. They feared what the freed slaves might feel justified to do to their communities if the US government decided to just place them in those communities in the south. This fear was a major reason why southerners took up arms on this issue. And in terms of immigration, many are afraid of what Middle Eastern immigrants, many whom had been victims of US military aggression in the Middle East, might feel justified to do to their communities if allowed to roam freely in the US. It’s not the same dynamic as slavery, but similar in terms of people not wanting the burden of accommodation placed on their communities.

The democrats struggled with their conciliatory approach being misconstrued as an invitation. Failure to convey this aspect during the Trump administration led many to think that borders were open and that since the Democrats were in power, they would simply let everyone in. Hence, why even more immigrants from central America migrated towards the US as soon Biden took office —thinking it was open borders/open season. Biden had to maneuver surreptitiously on the issue in order to quell the migrant surge without looking as though he was just as adamant as the republicans in protecting the borders, when in fact wanted to be. Keep in mind that Obama deported more illegals than Trump. Regardless, there were ways to quell public outrage without giving off the wrong impression. I think because the democrats were concerned about how Trump's reckless rhetoric would reflect on the entire country, they ultimately took the opposite extreme stance to help ease public outrage, but in doing so, they gave more credence to those radical far left elements than they may have wanted to, and now they were stuck with having to find a way out of it without looking as though they were betraying the impression they gave off while Trump was in office, an impression that made blacks think they would be getting reparations, and central Americans think they would be allowed to cross over into the US without restriction. While giving the benefit of the doubt to the democrats, one cannot discount the aspect of contrarianism that comes with leftism. Leftism is an oftentimes a contrarian opposition to whatever is perceived to be the social norm, and it doesn't matter if those social norms were once part of a leftist movement. Once something became traditional and identified by others as a part of their cultural identity, the leftist would began to go in the opposite direction. It is very possible that the same people that the left fought for in the beginning of a movement could later on began to serve as symbol of annoyance for the leftist archetype in the event that their goodwill towards those people became infused into an official expectation and perception of their natural identity by others. The leftist cannot stand to be categorized or stuck in a certain role or framework. That is his kryptonite. The traditionalist, on the other hand, operates in the opposite manner. At first, a new group of people, that is—a group that conservatives would find

strange or threatening would ultimately encounter opposition from those conservative or traditionalist entities who were trying to maintain what they perceive to be the social order or social norm. But after much resistance and help from leftist entities, the new group of people establish eventual victory over many forms of discrimination, turning the now social acceptance by those traditionalist entities that once opposed them into a part of the social norm, which thus leaves a new but old conflict in place as the leftist does not change how he feels about social norms, of which was the very base of his antipathy. Likewise, the traditionalist does not change how he feels about social changes, which was the base of his antipathy. Hence why the youth are prime target of indoctrination since any conservative archetype as a youth would ultimately be the one to later maintain an iron grip on what he has been taught throughout his life. The LGBTQ community is targeting kids in the hopes that a child that is of conservative inclination would grow to want to maintain what he has always been taught—in this case that transitioning to another sex is something to be embraced.

Chapter 6: Trump's Positive Qualities

In addition to the qualities mentioned, it's very important to make sure to touch base on another controversial quality that was being thrown around with much inaccuracy or incompleteness and that was the quality of diplomacy. It's pretty clear that Trump lacks diplomacy, but that could be considered an incomplete assessment. To say Donald Trump lacks tact and diplomacy was incomplete because those traits can be defined as multi-directional, meaning that its application in one direction doesn't automatically correlate to the same degree of how it would be applied, by that same person, in all directions. If that was the case, Donald Trump would get into a fight every time he met with someone face to face. But what was happening was that every single time he meets face to face with someone (even those initially opposed to him), they come out of the meeting with a totally different perspective of him. So why was it easy for Donald Trump to display a measure of tact and diplomacy with individuals directly, even to those who hate him, on an interpersonal basis, but struggle to find the right words when expressing himself outwardly and indirectly through speech and social media? One can argue he was doing this on purpose, but even the most overt forms of what is considered to be human rebellion, all seem to carry a fundamental lack of energy and inclination toward the very action that is being rebelled against. So, one has to ask themselves how important is the quality of one form of diplomacy, as we see in large quantity in the case of Donald Trump with regards to face to face or interpersonal communication, in comparison to the other forms, as it relates to communicating indirectly through public speech and social media, which we see lacking in the case for Donald Trump. Was one more important than the other? At the point of Donald Trump becoming president, only time would tell.

Trump, after he was elected President, continued to use reckless speech and many felt that he was wrong in how he responded to the death of a war hero like John McCain. Even if he felt there was absolutely no reason for him to engage in any form of statesmanship at that point, see that it would make no difference in how any message from him was received by the media and the

public at large, he should have still followed protocol and say the right things. By doing this, it would have allowed a case to be made that the media was willfully not acknowledging any attempt by him to say the right thing and would have given the public a chance to see that some balance needed to be restored overall. An attempt in this manner would have helped heal the political climate to a point of healthy conflict. The key was getting everyone to acknowledge some facts and not fight ignorance with more ignorance because then everyone loses credibility. It got to where both sides, republicans and democrats, were just turning off the news, not reading the paper, and telling themselves that the whole world was just going to hell and everything they hear was just gibberish. This polarization and cynicism leaves it to where it wouldn't matter who was in office, what the media was saying, as the narrative that folks would want to maintain was one that confirmed their negative sentiment.

As Donald Trump would resume his reckless statesmanship after the election, the credibility of the office of the President was put in jeopardy. While much of what President Trump said was oftentimes outrageous, the majority of the nation and world did not take him seriously because this was the tone he set from the very start of his presidential campaign. It's nothing new and highly expected and in that sense not as much of a threat to the nation as it would be if it was a president saying such things that didn't have the history of vulgarity that Trump had. The actual office of President, more so than the nation, was in danger. Fours years had gone by and this continued with no alteration or major upheaval domestically or globally, and consequently many would just assume that the office of President was just a title and anyone in that position was basically nothing to be concerned about or even worth listening to. Not only that, various agencies in the government may now make provisions as to how information is going to be shared with future presidents, further alienating the position from any major influence. After Trump, a vacancy to the office of President could be filled by a robot and it would make no difference to anyone.

The choice of words that Trump used during the election distorted the general nature of the policies that his words meant to describe and could have a permanent effect on some political

ideologies. For example "Ban all Muslims" or "Build a Wall" Saying these things distorted the nature of strict immigration policy in the minds of those who heard it, and conveyed a sense that "strict immigration policy" must mean "no immigrants allowed" I think everyone agrees that strict immigration policy was needed at times, however, when it's backed by seemingly hostile terms, our moral sensibilities get offended and the perspective of taking into account that sometimes strict immigration policies were needed now begins to seem so risky that it becomes better to just have the idea of strict immigration policy thrown out of our psyche. In reaction to this mindset and the heavy conflict that it had created, the opposing viewpoint that strict immigration policy was necessary at times had devolved into a mindset that those who don't believe it this way must surely be advocates of full blown globalism and open borders, with no boundaries amongst nations.

All in all, maybe a heavily scrutinized president was better than an un-scrutinized president. Heads of state seem to make their worst policy decisions when their approval rating was high or when no one was looking.

Chapter 7: Steep goals of the Trump Administration's

So far in office as of January 29, 2017, President Trump had taken measures on many of his campaign promises. The most significant being the executive order to temporarily ban immigrants from seven countries: Iraq, Syria, Iran, Libya, Somalia, Sudan and Yemen with the Syrian immigration ban lasting until further notice. His reasoning was based on the terrorist threat that immigration from those areas pose to the United States. The executive order had led to numerous protests throughout the US and many were calling into question America's moral fiber, sounding off with sayings such as "this is not us", pertaining to how America operates with regard to foreign policy and immigration. But when one looks back at the history of US immigration, Trump's actions in regard to the refugee crisis were not out of line with typical American immigration policy in response to a crisis. In the early 1900s, Japanese and people of India were denied entry to the US purely based on a belief of a lack of racial assimilability that they would posses living among the European American race. In the 1940's, thousands of Jews migrating from Europe to the US in order to escape the Holocaust were denied entry based on the State Department's fear that many of them could be Nazi Spies. In the late 70's, President Jimmy Carter, in response to the Iranian Hostage Crisis, banned all Iranians from entering the United States, fearing the impact it could have on US national security. Many say Trump's immigration ban was not the United States, but when you look back at history and the fact that Trump was able to effectuate such a restriction in today's age with astounding ease, it was safe to say that this was indeed the United States's way of handling immigration that could pose a threat to US security. Even the Obama administration had carried out large scale deportations of illegal migrants, much more than Trump would carry out during his tenure. It was clear that the main crux of the issue regarding Trump was not so much his policies, as it was the reckless words he used to back up his policies. In retrospect, Trump spoke harshly but carried a soft stick, compared to the action of previous presidents like Obama, Bush, and Clinton, especially when it came to foreign interventionism. This is unlike democrats, who in line with Teddy Roosevelt, often speak softly

while carrying a big stick. While many want to consider Christianity and the principle of Jesus Christ as the backdrop of America, the reality was that much of the things that people enjoy in America today was the result of some backing away from those religious principles and morals. Obviously one can strive in the way of virtue, but the sustenance and sometimes survival of countries and nations requires much more than virtue, leaving governments and populace with no choice but to seek a middle ground. Ideally it would feel great to fully align America with the teachings of Jesus Christ, but in actuality, doing so would require a sacrifice that many are not ready to make. While protesting on behalf of the refugees was imperative for the democrats due to the lack of statesmanship coming from the Trump administration, one had to be somewhat elated at the fact that Trump presented to many of those who didn't vote for him, the aspect of denying any wrongdoing regarding certain policies and playing the good cop, while also getting to enjoy the benefit of feeling safer from the threat of terrorism.

Stephen Bannon, a controversial appointee of Donald Trump and former executive chairman of Breitbart News and loyal tea party conservative who served as Donald Trump's presidential campaign CEO and later on, after Trump's election victory, as his chief strategist and senior counselor, had recently been elevated to a seat on the National Security Council. Drawing ire from both Republicans and Democrats alike, Trump decision to promote Bannon to such a position remains controversial as there was still some uncertainty about where Stephen Bannon stands ideologically. Most of the trepidation and angst that surrounds Stephen Bannon's name was due to his tenure as executive chairman of Breibart News, an extreme right winged news organization that had attracted the attention of some of the more feared sections of society like the Neo-Nazis and the KKK. His position within the organization had drawn a great deal of criticism from the media and members of the government. Stephen Bannon's politics can currently be classified as those which represent Tea Party conservatism: Hard Work, freedom from Government Control, and adoption of Judeo-Christian values, all of which can easily be entangled (into) or interpreted (into) the full-scale ideology of other anti-Establishment organizations, even if there are some significant

distinctions. His anti-government rhetoric in previous years had been mainly in response to the U.S. Government's handling of the 2008 financial crisis. Consigning trillions of dollars over to the banking industry, the United States government sparked some outrage and ignited a wave of Tea Party sentiment who view the bailout as an act of betrayal to U.S. taxpayers. Contending with the sense of security that the bailout had given to the general public on just how far the government would go to avoid a financial collapse, Bannon had persistently tried for many years to spark a sense of urgency from the public of just how dire the US financial situation was as it related to U.S. fiscal and trade deficits and how that made many current government welfare programs unsustainable. For years, Bannon had been outspoken on this matter. Recently, Bannon had been held by the media as the influential force behind Trump's administration, which was perhaps another reason why he was gaining so much notoriety in the process as someone to be feared; but this was mainly as a result of Bannon being on the same page as other Tea Party conservatives in the White House, especially as it relates to government spending, something that could cause a rift between the party and the President of the United States who had stated his intent to increase government spending.

On religion, Bannon was forthright in consigning the US conflict in the Middle East as part of an ongoing conflict between Christianity and Islam. Such a perspective of relegating the dynamics of how the US responded to 9/11 by invading Afghanistan and later Iraq to a religious connotation could be seen as an attempt on his part to remedy the insidious quality garnered by the US when they invaded a country without any justification.

Something that had been easy to gather from observation of Donald Trump's selection of cabinet members was his strong tendency to select very strong grassroots Tea Party supporters, and by grassroots, I am strongly conveying its distinction from the more astroturf Tea Party sectors which can be grouped in with basic Republicans due to the influence of corporate lobbyist, which had given the Tea Party in general, a pro-business reputation. However, true grassroots tea party perspective was not pro business, as much as it was free-market with "free" being the keyword there. Any positive business aspect that was generated had to be regarded as a

by-product of that founding principle. The Tea Party had to be defined first and foremost in terms of freedom. The only word that "pro" can be attached to in describing real grassroots Tea Party principles was "freedom" Over the years, what it was to be a Tea Party member had changed. Members who join continue to follow the same pattern of allowing corporate lobbyist to dictate the direction and principles of the party, turning it into a more pro-business entity than it wants to be. Just to re-iterate, the pro-business side of Tea Party agenda operates only as a by-product of its founding principle of freedom. Currently in the White House, the true grassroots portion of the Tea Party had more influence than it had had in years with three key individuals in position to enact changes along those founding principles: Stephen Bannon, Ben Carson, and Paul Ryan. Stephen Bannon as a member of the National Security Council, Ben Carson as a nominee to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and Paul Ryan as the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives. Trump's choice of Bannon and Carson as his cabinet members had more to do with the loyalty they showed to his campaign than their political ideologies; Bannon, as the CEO of his campaign and Ben Carson as a someone who often spoke up on behalf of Trump, even during times when the election was not in Trump's favor. However, Bannon and Carson's loyalty doesn't lie in the hands of one person as many would like to believe. While there was a strong support of Donald Trump from both Carson and Bannon, their absolute loyalty resides in the values and principles that the Tea Party was initially based upon: Freedom, Hardship/Hard work as a virtue, and Jude-Christain ethics. Recently, there had been reports of conflict within the staff of Donald Trump and if this was not the case now, eventually it would be so because the dilemma between what the public wants and what Tea Party supporters want and feel America needs would began to present itself. Was America prepared to deal with some of the sacrifices that Tea party supporters were prepared to effectuate in the name of maintaining what they feel were America's founding characteristics and ultimate freedom? The support by the public for Donald Trump was not based on a preparation for sacrifices, nor was that any part of Trump rhetoric. Support for Donald Trump was based on making life in America better by bringing in more jobs and reducing the

threat of terrorism as quickly as possible. The grassroots Tea Party supporters had a perspective that while those promises were great, they cannot come as a permanent resolution without facing some kind of hardship over a period of time. Bannon had conveyed forcefully that while the public may not be aware of it—the crisis, not just foreign and domestic, but also financial—was at a very critical stage at this very moment and if America doesn't prepare now by extracting itself from government over-reach, the breaking point would devastate the country beyond repair. The difficulty was articulating hardship and vigilance as a worthwhile pursuit; something that no one wants to hear. Hardship was a scenario that was easier to promote more along the lines of something to accept if already present, but promoting it as something to pursue in the name of something better in the future was very difficult especially while the current times, at least to the human eye of the general public, seem not good but manageable. This was why the government bailout of the banks in 2008 and 2009 served not only as a catalyst for Tea Party resurgence, but also as a hindrance to what it could have grown into because the message would have been one of accepting and facing with courage the hardship that arose from American banks defaulting instead of being one of trying to instill a sense of urgency on a crisis that was underlying as opposed to overt.

Understanding public protest of Donald Trump's policies—as a form of statesmanship, and as an American cultural aspect of not advocating even the most standard of operating procedures if backed by what can easily be perceived as taunts or a stance of complete opposition by key neighbors and allies of the USA—was not only important to the general welfare of the country and the globe, but also to understanding the concept of checks and balances the country was founded upon. The surprising outcome as it pertained to the reaction to policy under the Trump administration was the fact of more outrage coming from domestic spheres as opposed to it being concentrated to more foreign spheres. The liberal reaction can be argued to have served as a pacifying influence on what could have been and still can become an even more pronounced movement of anti-American sentiment backed by anger and terrorist aggression emanating from multiple sectors of

foreign origin, an origin that otherwise would have no grounds for unification, a reality that could change if rhetoric about Muslims from the current administration fails to differentiate before laws and policies would be enacted. Ideally, as a president would seek to impose harsh restrictions, his own verbal style and choice of words would serve as the pacifying influence to the reaction of how his agenda was effectuated. We saw this with President Barack Obama, while some of his policies were lenient, many were also restrictive. Many would not assume that Obama firmly handled immigration, but the fact of the matter was that he did. Two million immigrants were deported under the Obama Administration. No one also would suspect Obama to have bombed more people in the Middle East than George W Bush, but due to the impact of his conciliatory approach, many chose not to assign him as an aggressive president. Hence why Obama was largely considered a soft president. Obama was not one to espouse what could be perceived as a tone of animosity toward his neighbors as he, being commander in chief, took provisions to implement his policies. That, in a way, served as a misconception that Obama governed softly and more passively than he actually did. The war on terror can be fought in two ways: militarily and diplomatically. Militarily, to oppose the threat that was there and diplomatically, to oppose the threat it can become. America, unconsciously, didn't have a problem with tough legislation as it pertained to the safety of the country. It had a problem with statesmanship that gives off the wrong impression when it backs what would otherwise be considered necessary to some extent. Foreign reaction or lack thereof on the basis of general expectation to Donald's Trump policy implementation can be likened to a person's reaction to someone else transgressing them with that transgressor receiving a harsh rebuke from one of their own associates, as if the the associate took on the anger that would have manifested from the one being transgressed and thus leaving the aggrieved person to be less angry than they would have been. Many scenarios with an opposing force in play were good and many scenarios without that opposing force was bad. Donald Trump's perceived lack of statesmanship in explaining his implementation of policy combined with the reactive resistance from the American public had a way of being just as good as great statesmanship that

garnered no resistance or outrage even if it was not as aesthetically pleasing, for example, a band-aid that stops the loss of blood in the same way that the skin naturally does it. However, the fact of the current administration's existence was an indicator that there was a significant consensus that was weary of using pacification to ease the threat of terror, as opposed to brute force. Where that stands against the consensus of historical consequence as a factor in pacification's continued use was hard to determine exactly.

When it came to the economy, President Trump ran into some contention with the Federal Reserve, especially when it came to setting interest rates. The US economy was more deflationary before 1913 when Woodrow Wilson signed the Federal Reserve act. The downside to a deflationary-prone economy was obviously the higher likelihood of bank runs and financial panics, which were numerous before 1913. When the market decides interest rates, the seasonal demand for credit stresses the bank's reserves and strains their ability to respond to unforeseen market disturbances. This was why the Fed was created in the first place. And they were highly efficient at managing the economy when the dollar was still backed by gold. The first panic didn't occur until 1929, when the stock market crashed. It was not until the US left the Bretton woods system that inflation became a near mainstay for US economics. The Federal Reserve System was created as an entity, independent of US government control, to act as a central command post that controls the US monetary supply and demand by raising or lowering interest rates at different periods of either deflation or inflation. The reason for this was based on the concept that when inflation was allowed to flow unhindered, the economy became ripe for a sudden bust or crash due to a black swan event, which can be described as a sudden unforeseen circumstance that causes widespread panic and leads to the most feared scenario of any economy—everyone demanding their money at one time. As a consequence of the sudden demand, banks were left unable to acquire the capital needed to issue the money that everyone was trying to withdraw from their accounts. The result is that an economic depression ensues. The FDIC, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, was created so that everyone’s money held by the bank would be ensured by the federal government. Even if it didn’t exist, it created

enough public confidence to mitigate the possibility of the number one killer of any economy happening again, which was everyone trying to withdraw their money at one time, along with the banks not being able to get the credit from other banks needed to fund those transactions. A good question to ask is why was it easy to look at monetary issues from such an objective point of view that calls for the creation of elaborate contingency plans and systematic execution of those plans against unfavorable circumstances….why was it easy to manage all economic issues from that perspective? But yet in transition to politics and social issues, it becomes harder for humans to observe scenarios and events from that objective angle. The reason for that comes from a lack of awareness that too much of anything was bad and just like economics when the economy was expanding during inflationary periods, the too little of what had been happening whether considered favorable or unfavorable which in the case of an economy is deflationary periods, there is a tendency for the opposite circumstance to react in a very profound manner similar to a bolt of electricity that comes about when the imbalance of protons and neutrons are being restored to equilibrium by an electron traveling from negative to positive. In politics, the war in Afghanistan in reaction to the tragedy of 9/11 and the desire to give justice to the families and victims of it can be considered a time of great equilibrium in the United States, but that proton of pro Americanism continued to travel unopposed and eventually led to the war in Iraq which precipitated a movement of just the opposite—leftism, which, for the case of explaining the analogy, was a neutron in relation to the pro-Americanism of the war in Afghanistan. So as the proton (Pro Americanism from the War in Afghanistan) traveled and led to the war in Iraq, it created an imbalance of protons and neutrons (Leftism, just for the sake of this argument) that caused an electron to produce a charge by traveling from negative to positive in order to restore the equilibrium and thus setting off the movement of leftism and the election of Barack Obama. In order to reverse harmful policies and actions created by unopposed pro Americanism that led to the War in Iraq, Leftism traveled in its prospective direction for 8 years until another imbalance occurred leading to another electric charge and setting the protons (Pro

Americanism for the sake of argument) back in motion. However, judging from the protests and indignation in response to the Trump administration, it was possible that the electric charge which sparked the pro Americanism that resulted in Donald Trump's election victory set in motion protons traveling much faster than normal and in turn creating another pro-American/Leftism imbalance.

The 2000 dot com bubble and bust and subsequent 2008 financial crisis was the result of Alan Greenspan refusing to raise interest rates to counter inflation. During Trump's tenure, it became a hot button issue of Janet Yellen wanting to raise interest rates while inflation was still low...beneath the 2% target. The end result of it seemed like it would stifle the market during times when fundamentals point to a bull run. Imagine the market falling immediately after the corporate tax rate was lowered to 15 percent.

Another issue during the Trump's first term was Obamacare (Affordable Care Act). Since ACA artificially raised the demand for insurance by forcing people to sign up for health insurance, which in turn incentivizes insurance companies to raise premium costs, many in the Republican Party felt that the Affordable Care Act was unsustainable and could potentially trigger a debt crisis. Many proponents of the free market felt that subsidized healthcare was turning the country into a nanny state. However, one as to ask in especially in light of the trade war that would occur between Trump and China, whats the point of capitalism, when socialist/communist countries can just steal innovation/intellectual property and mass produce the goods and services arising from that innovation using government subsidized industry? Its as if there was never any distinction between the two countries' economic principles. I always thought capitalism's main goal was to incentivize the individual to innovate, buts what the advantage to that if one's innovation isn't proprietary and can be used on a global scale. Capitalism would function ideally if capitalist countries only traded with other capitalist countries. The West was always speaking out against the evils of socialism/communism but at the same time allows their economy to not only do business with these socialist countries, but also give away (on a silver platter) any and all economic advantage. Now those socialist countries can continue to

advocate their philosophy while growing their economy on another country's innovation.

Socialism is when the workers own the means of production. Since this had proven impossible throughout history, socialism had always ended up turning into Communism, which allows for the State to own the means of production. Today, however, there a growing movement of Socialist who actually believe that they would be the ones to implement true Socialism. Socialism itself was not problematic if it actually works. The resistance to Socialism and the reason it had a bad rap amongst the conservatives was that Socialism had never been successfully implemented. Every case had always devolved into full-fledged communism.

One thing that could hurt the US economy was domestic frustration with the Trump presidency causing a widespread emigration of American citizens to other parts of the world. More Americans were opting to live abroad and many smaller countries were seizing the opportunity to welcome them. This would compound the effect of foreign businesses leaving the United States. So in a sense, the administration had to beware of the possible trade-off between more jobs and a less valuable US dollar as our economy had been building itself with debt for a while. Everything was based on a belief and this belief in the US to meet its obligations would face some tension if American emigration turned into a noticeable issue in two years.

The talk of debt, no matter how massive, was only relevant if it begins to affect the value of the US dollar. Countries that lack crude reserves had to hold American's currency in order to import crude into their country. As long as the major exporters of Oil were selling it for US dollars, the US economy would remain afloat because the global demand for oil would automatically correlate to a global demand for USD. This factor also makes it very difficult for countries, who were antagonist to the US, to give up accepting USD because its value allows them to purchase other goods for very cheap, which thus boosts their economy. The only real threat was Russia's presence in the Middle East. This could serve as a critical factor that could have a major effect on the future of the US economy. Just think, if we removed all of our influence in the Middle East, Russia could spread theirs and pitch the idea to major

exporters of oil to accept some other form of payment for oil in exchange for Russian military protection. This scenario would really be a true death knell for the US economy. It would be interesting to see how this Saudi/US tension about Khashoggi''s death plays out. The US should be firm, but also understand that it could open the door for Russia to start sweet-talking the Saudis. The dangerous game here was that this could provoke more countries into becoming hostile toward the US dollar, perhaps by threatening to create something backed by gold. However, since the US owns the most gold out of all the other countries, then that may not even matter if the amount of gold owned by the US is enough to back the current supply of US dollars in circulation. The US would still come out on top and actually the other countries would suffer because by doing that you effectively put a damper on your own economic expansion without hurting the US dollar's standing. Aside from the negative aspect of inflation, fiat currency often works to everyone's benefit because it allows more money to be printed and lent out, which in turn allows more goods and services to be produced.

It was clear that President Trump’s grip on the economy would be front and center for the 2020 election. He would not only need to boast lower unemployment, but also a robust stock market in order to get re-elected. Analysts were concerned that the stock market would continue to see more declines if the Fed kept raising the interest rates. Many of Trump’s supporters felt that the Fed was operating to subvert Trump’s goal to stimulate the economy, and this outlook was further exacerbated by the pressure put on the Trump administration to shut down the economy in 2020 in response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

It’s important to keep in mind that politicians are only judged by what happens while they are in office. Rarely are they judged by the long term implications of their policies. The blame or credit for manifest implications arising from a previous administration's policies or actions are often assigned to whatever the present administration is. An example was the transition from the Reagan administration to the George HW Bush administration back in the late 80's and how H.W. Bush was blamed for the implications of Reagan's high spending, low tax economic strategy that served the US economy well during Reagan's time, but had manifest

implications that took place during H.W. Bush's tenure, forcing him to raise taxes. The general public rarely sees it from this angle, and so politicians continue to cater to the present moment without giving any importance to how it may affect years down the road.

The trade war between Trump and the Chinese Communist party was inevitable, but US didn't start it. China was going to continue to raise taxes on imports and devalue their currency until someone did something about it, and actually it was the Obama Administration that stepped in first and imposed a series of tariffs on Chinese goods. Trump's tariffs was was just a continuation of it. Expropriation by the Chinese Govt of a US company's property based in China could have become a reality, and it would have been China that made the first move in regards to expropriation, and Trump would have likely retaliated. It could have gotten very ugly, but Trump was always willing to negotiate, which served as a redeeming quality of his.

Economic Espionage had become a flashpoint for the Trump administration in response to China's unfair trade practices. How would a trade deal with China's government, however, help crack down on these practices? was an enforceable clause(one that can be enforced in China) in any trade deal even possible……. if China's government was indeed relentless about accessing the nation's secrets? The market could seriously tank if investors read more about economic espionage attempts by China as that would seriously undermine the reality of a workable China/US trade deal in the near term.

Chapter 8: The Military Industrial Complex

While President Trump had lost credibility on many policy-related issues as being beneficial to the country, many were failing to recognize the importance of one very crucial intention that could make or break the U.S. in its desire to avoid a major conflict with another country and that was Trump's desire for military rearmament. While the U.S. was known to have the strongest military force in the world, many had begun to draw a conclusion that Russia was not far behind. Prior to Russia's invasion of Ukraine, many around the world use to sleep well because of the existence and deterring aspect of NATO, but the fact remains that in the event of a nuclear crisis, the plan by NATO in response to an attack from another country is retaliation. Russia, on the other hand, at least to my knowledge is one that is pre-emptive. So if a crisis between Russia and US were to occur, Russia would strike first. But for their sake, that strike would have to decimate the US completely, otherwise they would face a complete nuclear retaliatory attack from the US and western Europe that would certainly wipe Russia off the map and into oblivion.

Why Trump's military spending goal was so important has to do with a lesson from history and an overlooked possible negative outcome for the US. The last time the US engaged in a major military re-armament was during the Reagan administration which led to the end of cold war. US military capability as a result of Reagan's military expansion led to USSR General Secretary Gorbachev's decision to democratize soviet politics. US military power alone was enough to convince a long-time enemy to acquiesce in their global expansionism. Had Reagan not pursued this rearmament, there was no telling where or what the Cold War could have led to. As long as Trump was in office, and as long as he was unwilling to engage in pacification politics though statesmanship, it would become more of a necessity for him to adopt some sort of conciliatory measure, which in this case would be fear and intimidation serving as the pacifying element. This is a hallmark of GOP politics. While it seems like the end result of military rearmament was war, the fact that Reagan did this very same thing which led to the end of the Cold War without bloodshed

between the Soviets and the U.S. was proof that peace through strength can be an effective protocol. Much of our current conflict with Russia was based on one fact and that was the double standard set by the US in which it was ok for them to throw around their geopolitical weight by attacking countries that don't believe in their form of democracy and at the same time restricting other countries from doing the same. Strength and position and the maintenance of it was an overlooked factor in politics as being a desired key element integral to a nation's existence and survival. However, the U.S. to their credit never looks to expand territory-wise; the U.S. mostly seeks to contain. Something that cannot be said to be a goal of other country's leaders , that is, if they were in the same position of strength and privilege.

One of Trump's first major foreign policy moves was confronting North Korea's nuclear provocations militarily instead of diplomatically. North Korea had a history of conducting nuclear missile tests in the region, often threatening the sovereignty of South Korea. Prior to Trump's intervention, the situation was one of containment, by which American officials would attempt to circumvent the dangers of North Korea by using political and diplomatic means, as opposed to military threats. This changed after Trump entered office when he deployed the US military to the Korean Peninsula in order to intimidate N. Korea into complying with US demands. But peace through strength backfired in this case. Because of the size and strength of the American military relative to North Korea's, North Korea would not only feel, but also and more importantly attempt to "look" justified in launching a preemptive nuclear strike. And yet if the U.S. responds with a nuclear strike of their own, Iran and Russia would most likely respond and strike the US with one of their own due to the legitimacy of North Korea's justification which would have been solely based on the fact of the sheer size and strength of the American military in comparison to theirs.

Trump was exacerbating the threat into a self-fulfilling prophecy of N. Korea actually becoming an imminent threat to the safety of Americans, when—in fact—at that moment, they were not, even in lieu of N. Korea's missile testing. In hindsight, the US conflict with N. Korea was not based on US military aggression

toward them, but based on political slaps on the wrists—if you will. This current dynamic would change, however. The conflict would become based on real potential aggression from the US and if it continued, along with the probability of N. Korea fulfilling their promise of an actual nuclear strike in an attempt to decimate mainland US, the potential for catastrophe would have doubled in a very short span of time, and the result would set off a global nuclear conflict. This set the stage for a new paradigm in geopolitics, which would end up being further exacerbated when the democrats, who castigated Trump's approach to N. Korea, would ultimately consign to the peace through strength protocol and go down the pro-war rabbit hole. Consequently, when it came to North Korea, all the US could do was sit and watch these test proceed. This confrontation came down to who draws first blood, and not necessarily with the use of nuclear weaponry but with just the use of standard military artillery. Kim Jong Un, the North Korean dictator, may have been crazy but not stupid. He wouldn't fire on the US first and the US surely would not fire on N. Korea first. However, all it would take was some form of miscommunication on either side caused by someone misinterpreting what they believed to be an executive order to fire on enemy targets, and this would have been enough to cause a full scale military conflict to ensue. At this time, Trump supporters were heavily in favor of using military means to confront North Korea, which turned out to be ironic when many of them criticized the democrats for taking a hard-line stance against Russia just prior to Russia's invasion of Ukraine. In the case of N. Korea, the democrats were outright against military action from the US. This is when the democrats were considered to be anti-war. In any case, the US could not take any preemptive military action against N. Korea because doing so would change the global military climate and literally make it ok for other countries to launch attacks on countries it considers to be a threat regardless of any other factors. The US had to wait for N. Korea to strike first and then use every inch of military capability at their disposal to neutralize any threat from N. Korea, past, present, and future. Bringing the US military into geopolitics with N. Korea ended up being counter intuitive because it hastened their nuclear development and changed the entire dynamic that existed between

the US and N. Korea, a dynamic that was political and not aggressive. History indicates that nuclear intent cannot be stopped when it reaches a certain point. The only solution was to accept N. Korea as a nuclear power because attacking them on the basis of nuclear development sends a message to other nations like Russia and Iran that the US could possibly do the same to them. Besides, if the US attacked North Korea first, the US would be violating NATO's defense only policy when it comes to nuclear conflict. Retaliation was the best foreign policy. These preventative measures that the US military was employing was only hurting the country. It would be better to back off and let other countries know that if they try a pearl harbor or a 9/11, retaliation from the US or Western Europe would be swift and final. Going on the offensive based on what someone might do is ultimately unjust. The US and the UK tried to apply that caveat after they launched an unjustified invasion of Iraq. Sure, allowing others to hit first cost lives, but one would rather die knowing that the country they live in would know they deserve justice and would do everything it can to seek it, as opposed to having to speculate and debate whether any reaction was warranted.

While Trump was the commander and chief of the armed forces, it is possible that he made the mistake of delegating way too much responsibility to his generals, who were always going to opt for war. George W Bush made the same mistake, giving his Vice President Dick Cheney immense decision making power regarding US foreign policy in the Middle East. On the N. Korean issue, China said they would defend N. Korea should the US strike first. This shows that there were indirect implications to striking N. Korea first. The American public, especially the democrats, didn’t want a world war as they couldn't even stomach US troops fighting in the Middle East, to the point that they willingly voted a minority into office just to get the troops out of there. Surely, the American public didn't make a 180 degree turn in such a short span of time in how it views war. After Trump left office, the democrats found themselves upholding the same manner of military interventionism that they castigated Trump for during his confrontation with North Korea.

Trump, during the tension the North Korea, had made use former NBA basketball player Dennis Rodman, who was the first

American to meet face to face with Kim Jung Un. Rodman's relevance to the situation could not be denied, no matter how hard the establishment tried to distance themselves from him. The problem was that Rodman's public antics and image over the years make it hard for anyone in the general public to take him seriously. Of course, our government agencies don't resort to such willful obtusion regarding something of potential benefit to US security. When you look at the heart of the situation and the fact that he was the only American to ever have a face to face meeting with the N Korea dictator, one had to conclude that the Dennis Rodman angle regarding this matter was very important. The result of Trump willing to listen resulted in the release of an American detainee from North Korea, one of whom later died in the hospital as a result of illness acquired while imprisoned there.

While those who were not worried about N. Korea continued to look at the entire situation one-dimensionally, all the potential unfavorable scenarios continued to line up. It was not a question of North Korea striking first. It became a question of what the US considers a strike and what China considers a strike. What if North Korea had said "we would strike somewhere" and later on (not right after) fires in that direction and purposely misses their target, and then claims it was just another test? There would have been no casualties, but the US would not have seen it that way and would have retaliated with a military strike on NK, as China and other countries understood North Korea to simply be conducting another nuclear test. This revolting dynamic between N. Korea and the US was brought on by the order for US troops to go to Korean Peninsula to confront Kim Jung Un. The US could have either stretched the war of words out as long as possible to avoid a military conflict or let it continue to progress into something that would have brought us closer to military conflict. The whole premise of attacking N Korea was based on preventing them from ever developing a major nuclear arsenal. But they already had, so where does one go from here? Was it even possible to stop any nation from developing a strong nuclear arsenal? The social construct was developed so that the species can survive. Its a natural instinct. Before technology, the social construct need only be limited to a small radius of people because humans were only a threat to each other at shorter

distances, but now as technology has increased, humans have become a threat to each other at very long distances, which creates the need for people within a much larger radius to conference on the subject of human survival. This need had evolved, coming about from the framework of people within a village, later to within a city, then within a state, within a region, and now spanning the entire globe, which is why globalism became a concept in the first place.

Fortunately Trump was able to de-escalate the crisis by getting N. Korea to negotiate, which made Trump the first US president to visit North Korea and meet the dictator in person. It was an amazing accomplishment by President Trump. He took every risk with N. Korea and was now reaping the rewards. Many were expecting a bad outcome with N. Korea, but was wrong about it. Trump had also been very open minded in allowing Dennis Rodman to use his influence to help the situation. He took Dennis Rodman serious despite his looks and antics. The last administration wouldn't even go near him even if it could have helped them with N. Korea. Goes to show that what President Trump lacked in statesmanship, he made up for it in other ways like bring open minded when trying to solve a problem and willing to communicate with almost anyone. The one thing Trump had going for him was his luck. Not many take that into account. Even if he's not crossing the T's and dotting the i's, his sentences still manage to end with the proper punctuation. Trump did everything wrong during his campaign, but won the election. Trump did everything wrong with N Korea, but managed to arrange talks instead of a war. How far-fetched was it to say, at this juncture, that the next thing Trump does wrong would somehow lead to an end-result that would end up right in his favor. I was thinking to myself at this time that if his first term manages to finish without a major trade war with China, a full blown war with Syria, or segregation within the US, then it would have be wise for him to leave a "Don't try this at home" for all future Presidents to come afterward. At this juncture one had to wonder if it would be unwise for Trump to do an about face on his verbal style. Most of the world had already adapted to it and could now brace themselves for the next off-the-wall tweet or statement. Liberal protest combined with Trump's verbal expression canceled out many of the negative effects of his rhetoric. Trump could

continue to speak his mind so long as the public remained outraged by it. If outrage had lessened and complacency toward his speaking manner ensued, then the negative effects could have begun to present itself. This aspect of reckless speech would later catch up to Trump when he incited a large mob on January 6th of 2021, as a number of his supporters stormed the US capital in protest of the 2020 election results of which Biden had become the winner. At the same time, however, numerous democrats like Maxine Waters had called for protests using words that could have incited violence during Trump's tenure. In fact many BLM protests backed by far left rhetoric resulted in fatalities. Not to mention, multiple celebrities made death threats against President Trump without any legal repercussion. Still and all, it was sad to see Trump inciting violence as his tenure came to an end. It brought back those unsettling feelings in 2016-2017 when many prominent figures were publicly calling for Trump's assassination after he won the 2016 election fairly. While many can argue that it's in the US constitution that freedom of speech can be regulated if it presents clear and present danger, the fact that the law had not been applied uniformly sets the stage for a new paradigm in American political history, where the justice department could be weaponized against political opposition. It was customary not to bring charges upon ex-presidents, mainly because of the Pandora's box that it opens—if one ex president should be held accountable, then surely all ex-presidents should be held accountable as well. The Bush, Obama, and Biden administrations were all in egregious violation of international law. Bush for his role in launching an unjustified invasion of Iraq which led to numerous war crimes carried out by US soldiers, which was a violation of the Geneva Convention. Obama's drone program and military excursion into Libya created a humanitarian catastrophe, in what would be a continuation of the US military's failure to comply with the Geneva Convention. Biden's vaccine mandates, using coercion to get people to comply to a booster shot protocol that was not approved by an regulatory body for safety was a direct violation of the Nuremberg code. Not to mention, Biden may have taken classified documents from the White House while he was still Vice President. There is also the Burisma scandal in which Biden used his influence as Vice President

and allegedly received payment in exchange for helping remove the prosecutor investigating the Ukrainian natural gas company for corruption. Joe Biden's son, Hunter, was also employed with the company. So by seeking to indict Trump, the Democratic Party may have gone down another rabbit hole of cultivating a paradigm of which its normal for politicians to weaponize law enforcement and go after political opponents.

The Justice department later indicted Trump for violating the Espionage act, and as a result, he won't get a public defense trial. Prosecution won't even have to prove intent. The last people that were convicted of violating the espionage act in relation to nuclear secrets were executed. This would further divide the country as allegations against Biden regarding his seizure of classified documents from the White House while he was still Vice President had not been pursued by any enforcement agencies. There is also the Burisma controversy in which FBI attempted to silence social media platforms regarding information surrounding Hunter Biden's laptop. The FBI knew about the Hunter Biden laptop, and there was some confirmation bias involved. The FBI was certain that the contents on the hard drive of the laptop were linked to a Russian disinformation campaign, which had been rampant on social media prior to the Trump election in 2016, hence why they could try and justify telling Facebook to suppress information regarding the Hunter Biden laptop. Obviously in this political climate, one had to ask if suspicion of Russian disinformation was a spigot aimed to protect Joe Biden and help him win the election in 2020. Moreover, when it comes to email forgery, which at the time was largely suspected to have been carried out by Russian operatives, much of the nefarious components had arose abroad, not originating in Russia, but in Ukraine, as there were corrupt elements there claiming to have damning information on Hunter Biden and offering to sell the information they were purporting to have to Trump associates for five million. Ukrainian legislator Andrii Derkach had claimed to have a laptop belonging to Hunter Biden. He was later sanctioned by the US. Linking the Hunter Biden laptop contents to a Russian disinformation campaign slowed down getting to the bottom the investigation, but at this point many of the emails on the laptop had already been verified as authentic, and

many mainstream media outlets were just now confirming this after the 2020 election. One of the Burisma executives, Vadym Pozharskyi, at the behest of Hunter Biden, met with Joe Biden at a dinner party in 2015 and shortly thereafter, Joe Biden had the prosecutor probing corruption at Burisma removed while Biden was still Vice President of the US. Easy to see how that raises suspicion. But it was allegedly confirmed by attendee Rick Leach of the World Food Programme that the dinner was only about food security and not politics, and that Biden didn't stay very long at the dinner, never even sitting down. Still and all, this was never probed or looked into by investigators. The day after the event, Vadym Pozharskyi sent Hunter Biden an email thanking him for introducing him to his father. So it was likely that they did speak to each other. About what? There was no way to confirm at this point, nor does it seem there would ever be an investigation. Delaware computer store owner Mac Isaac, who first received the laptop from Hunter Biden, was shocked this nor the laptop was even mentioned at the Trump impeachment trial in 2020. Right now, the criminal charges that could be pursued against Hunter Biden had to do with him not reporting his income from his various Chinese business dealing as indicated in the emails on his laptop and also having purchased a gun while being addicted to drugs. Of course after the fact, a number of media outlets were now admitting that the emails on Hunter Biden's laptop were not Russian disinformation.

Chapter 9: America's Inability to Foresee a Crisis

In retrospect, the misuse of momentum was why the country was in the state it was in. It goes back to the War in Iraq. After 9/11, the country came together on a surge of patriotism and national pride in America. The momentum carried the country into the war in Afghanistan so that justice could be attained for the victims of 9/11. Somehow, that momentum gave the Bush administration the green light to go after Iraq on the premise that Saddam Hussein was developing weapons of mass destruction. No evidence was ever found and the great national revival to seek justice for 9/11 was wasted. It basically devolved into serious contention between political parties over the justness of our military action in the Middle East and injured our moral standing in the world. What if restraint had been used and we only stuck with the fight in Afghanistan to overthrow the Taliban (which by the way never happened) and achieved the measure of justice for the victims of 9/11 that we originally set out to get? For sure, things would be different. Fast forward to 2015, in the wake of the shooting deaths of Trayvon Martin, Michael Brown, and Eric Garner, the black community comes together to protest the excessive use of force by police officers and the lack of accountability levied upon them by the justice system. The momentum arising from this gave the organizers of this movement called "Black Lives Matter," the gumption to throw the entire white community under the bus regarding this matter, openly express the desire to kill police officers and white people, set race relations back 60 years, and empower opposition like the KKK and Neo Nazis to recruit in the name of self-preservation. What if restraint had been used with the focus of peaceful protest kept strictly on police brutality? Things would probably be different. Now fast forward to April 2017, Assad, president of Syria, launches a gas attack on innocent children in Syria, which gave some momentum back to America's military efforts in the Middle East and their credibility in calling for the removal of Assad's regime. With it, President Trump rightfully launches an airstrike in Syria in response to it and another in Afghanistan in response to ISIS. But just like before, instead of showing restraint, the US decides take the momentum arising from

righteous action in the Middle East and allow it to immediately carry us into a military conflict with N. Korea, giving the order to send navy carrier strike groups to the Korea Peninsula, upset a very sensitive situation, and turn our political contention with N. Korea into a military one and thus effectively speeding up their nuclear program and setting the stage for a potential World War III scenario. Momentum was a good thing, but without restraint, it usually leads to crash and the offsetting of the good reaction that it was originally built upon. It's thus very dangerous to be caught up in a narrative. Anything that threatens it tends to bring on cognitive dissonance. Cognitive Dissonance was why people would hold on to an opinion or feeling even when overwhelming evidence clearly nullifies it. Cognitive dissonance is that uncomfortable feeling you get when your thoughts, words, and actions don't line up with your behaviors. So in order to avoid this uncomfortable feeling, humans would refuse to accept or express anything, even facts and truths, just so they can avoid that feeling, that cognitive dissonance. This is a mistake. In order to heal the political climate we're in now, everyone needs embrace cognitive dissonance as a virtue. I think we all had a fear of losing credibility in the acknowledgment of truth that didn't line up with up our latest assertions and also being declared unreliable because of that. Read Psychoanalysis by Sigmund Freud. This quote lines up perfectly with these issues of today's political climate. This is from Freud's book "Psychoanalysis" from pg 257-258. "No one who changes his views once or twice deserves to be believed, for it was only too likely that he would be mistaken again in his latest assertions; but anyone who sticks to anything he had once said, or refuses to give way upon it easily enough, was obstinate or pig-headed, was it not so? What was to be done in the face of these self contradictory criticisms except to remain as one was and behave as seems best to one?"

The next major crisis in the United States is always the one that is not on the radar. You might be asking what could that be… since as of 2023, there are myriad problems in the world being covered in the news and media. So in this regard, it's very hard not to anticipate another crisis or major issue occurring in the near future. As of 2023, there is racial tension in the United States, ongoing geopolitical problems in the Middle East, a war in eastern

Europe that could become a nuclear conflict resulting in the loss of millions of lives. There is also an existential crisis regarding the nation, in terms of its national security, economy and unifying doctrine. Religion, social issues, climate, immigration, relationships, foreign policy, economy, law and the survival of the country are all at the forefront of discourse. There are also conversations about the uneven distribution of wealth, with more and more wealth falling into the hands of a few wealthy elites, leading to the decline of the middle class and potentially setting off a class war. Most people would agree that there are so many problems facing the US and the world for that matter. But even as it is apparent that people are as hyper-vigilant as ever, one can still discern that there must something that is being neglected, and that something could ultimately become the next major crisis. This is where foresight and critical thinking comes in. How many people could have predicted back in the 90s when the United States was completely tuned in to what was happening with the Bill Clinton/Monica Lewinsky scandal, that the next major crisis in the United States would involve national security and foreign terror. No one could have predicted such at that time…but it goes to show that the major problems that happen in society are often the ones not being talked about. There was nothing to indicate that such an attack like 9/11 was imminent, at least not from the vantage point of the average American in the late 90s. Of course, there were exceptions; in fact, there are always people who try to warn in advance an impending doom, but in most cases, these archetypes are relegated as conspiracy theorists and mentally ill. When it comes to foreseeing a threat before it comes to pass, especially as it relates to perhaps the most significant crisis in America—that being 9/11, two names stick out in my mind—Bill Cooper and Donald Trump. Bill Cooper warned back in June of 2001 on his broadcast “Hour of the Time” that a major terrorist attack would soon take place in the US and that it would be blamed on Osama Bin Laden. Shortly thereafter, two commercial airlines were flown into the Twin Towers at the World Trade Center. Donald Trump, in his book “The America We Deserve”, which was published in 2000, also warned that a terrorist attack which would make the 1993 World Trade Center bombing pale in comparison would soon take place in

the United States. He was also correct in his assessment.

The Bush administration, following the 9/11 terror attacks, made national security and fighting Islamic extremism the number one priority for the country. In doing so, Bush kept the nation safe, but consequently was unable to surmise the brewing financial crisis that was about to affect the US economy in what would become another unforeseen crisis. Regulation in the banking and finance industry had been ignored and neglected. Thus, seven years after 9/11, the stock market crashed as a number of investment banking firms collapsed, which forced the United States government to intervene and bail out the banking industry, a move that upended faith in the free markets. Another example is the anti-police social unrest that occurred late in the Obama administration. When Obama first entered office, the major issues were getting US troops out of Iraq, recovering the from the 2008 financial crisis, and dealing with universal healthcare and inner city crime. Police brutality, the eventual public reaction and ethnic hostilities was not on the radar early in Obama's tenure. However, the largely neglected issue concerning excessive use of force by police officers and the lack of accountability applied finally exploded into national consciousness circa 2012—creating a rift among the different social and ethnic classes, as the problem was assigned to having ethnic overtones. Prior to this, the major problems were foreign terrorism, the Middle East, immigration, climate change, healthcare, and tensions between the rich and poor—as indicated by the occupy movements in New York and Boston. No one could have predicted that the nation was about to become more divided than it has ever been along racial lines, and that the rule of law was going face its biggest backlash since the early 1990s in the wake of the Rodney King beating. But yet as these new problems of ethnic tension and police brutality began to become crystallized into America's national psyche, the public would find itself distracted from another unforeseen problem—a public health crisis. Here we see this dynamic play itself out again. While we are fully attuned into one set of problems, we ultimately ignore another set of potential problems, and this is the main reason why it is hard to prevent the next major crisis. In retrospect, President Trump's tenure began as ethnic problems and police brutality were

becoming ingrained as America's most central of issues. On top of that, there were still the other problems being carried over from the previous Bush and Obama administrations—the Middle East, Islamic terror, climate, healthcare, immigration, economic inequalities, the racial division, police brutality, and crime were all issues that the new incoming President Trump had to contend with. However, new unforeseen problems would occur as President Trump's tenure began. The Trump administration began a course of hard-line foreign policy, nearly bringing the nation into a nuclear conflict with North Korea and creating a geopolitical environment that could lead to devastating conflict among major powers. However, Trump would soften his stance and ultimately push for negotiations with geopolitical foes. Still and all, the seeds were sown and now the risk of nuclear conflict weighed on the minds of Americans, much as it did during the Cuban Missile crisis. While all of this is going on—the ongoing problems from the Bush and Obama Administration, along with the new geopolitical problems initiated by the Trump administration, no one was thinking about a public health crisis. It rarely crossed anyone's mind that such could be the next major crisis. In retrospect, one would have predicted that a civil war, border overrun, a major Islamic terror attack, global warming crisis, a stock market crash, or nuclear conflict would have occurred before a global pandemic. But yet in early 2020 a highly contagious coronavirus would expand beyond China's borders and trigger a worldwide pandemic leading to the deaths of millions of people. And now as the world became mired in this new health crisis, all while remaining attuned to the previous problems like immigration, climate change, economic inequality, Middle East, racial division, police brutality, crime, economics, etc, most people would ultimately apply little to no awareness about a little-known conflict in Eastern Europe called the Donbas conflict, in which Russia was heavily involved in arming separatists against the sovereign state of Ukraine. Russia eventually launched an invasion of the country in 2022 and set off the largest scale conflict in Europe since World War II.

The lesson here is that no problem is a thing of the past. Believing so only induces an arrogance and complacency that ultimately paves the way for its resurgence. In order to keep

problems at bay, society has to constantly remain vigilant about ongoing problems and also problems that could arise in future due to neglect and complacency. With all the calamity being covered in both mass and independent media, it's easy to believe that everything that could become a problem is already being talked about at some level. However, I will contend that America's next major crisis will involve problems regarding the neglect of safety regulations. We have been hearing about accidents in the news, but there hasn't been much discourse about the significance of those incidents being related to a larger overarching problem of neglect when it comes to basic safety protocols. There was the Surfside condominium collapse that occurred in Florida in 2021. There have also been numerous train derailments. The vaccine injury crisis is happening as we speak, but is yet to be considered as part of larger subset of neglect when it comes to safety protocols. The most recent example of neglect of safety regulations—which could be considered the opening bell for a major safety regulation crisis in the United States—was the implosion of OceanGate's underwater deep sea submersible that killed five people on board. The straw that will break the camel's back, however, will likely be a series of commercial airline crashes that would occur as a result of complacency since nowadays it is very easy for many to assume that airline crashes are a thing of the past.

Another potential crisis to look out for which is not on the radar at the moment is the resurgence of organized crime. This has largely been subdued since the 1990s, but can become a dominant force again, especially as banks tighten lending standards and as many of the country's public safety and national security institutions are being threatened with de-funding. Keep in mind that the Clinton administration reduced the US intelligence-gathering budget in the years leading up to 9/11, believing that there was no need for heightened vigilance. The same de-funding aspect is likely to occur with regard to police and federal agencies, which would lead to the resurgence of organized crime and gangster capitalism.

Chapter 10: The new Democrat pro-war paradigm and Syria

A growing restlessness at home that saw no end in sight to the US wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, which gave rise to a war weary sentiment that insisted a complete pullout of US forces from the region as quickly as possible. Americans became desperate for a change in US foreign policy and during the 2008 presidential election, Barack Obama presented a platform to the American public that revolved around bringing troops home, and moving forward with a foreign policy that would depart with direct US intervention in foreign conflict. Obama promised to withdraw US troops from Afghanistan and Iraq and also repair damaged US foreign relations which occurred as a result of previous foreign policy. He also stated his intention to restore the multilateral approach of cooperating with international organizations. This platform helped Barack Obama win the 2008 presidential election and in just eight months after he entered office, he would win the Nobel Peace Prize. And by the end of 2011, Obama withdrew US forces from Iraq. However, the Arab Spring in 2011 which provoked widespread protests throughout the Middle East and North Africa would challenge Obama's original platform of US non-intervention overseas. As these protests triggered violent government crackdowns on protesters in Libya and Syria which led to numerous civilian deaths, pressure was put on the Obama administration to intervene in a growing human rights catastrophe. Obama would facilitate the overthrow of Gaddafi from Libya in 2011, despite Libya posing no imminent threat to the United States. NATO forces conducted airstrikes on various Libyan military posts, which caused more civilian casualties and gave rise to more extremism. The Obama administration then asserted regime change in Syria by recognizing the anti-government/anti-Assad rebels as the official governing authority of the country. Meanwhile, ISIS, a terrorist group made up of former Al Qaeda operatives, Iraqi insurgents, and Saddam loyalists, began embarking upon a series of attacks in Iraq and Syria after declaring a worldwide caliphate. Shortly thereafter, they managed to seize large swaths of territory in both nations. This led to US re-engagement, forcing the Obama

administration to order airstrikes in Iraq and Syria in order to stop further destabilization of the region. The growing ISIS threat in Syria led to Russia sending military aid in form of air support in 2015 to back the Assad regime against the Syrian rebels and ISIS. Once again, the Middle East had become a hotbed of violence and terror. Before long, both Libya and Syria would become a humanitarian catastrophe. US foreign policy during the Obama administration, despite its stated goals of pursuing diplomacy and better international relations, did little to resolve the Middle East crisis. The administration would also set the stage for growing US tension with Russia.

In terms of foreign policy during the Trump administration, Bashar al Assad, the president of Syria, was a major point of contention for the United States. In retrospect, the Obama administration had intervened in Syria in 2011, declaring Assad's opposition as the official ruling party of the country before subsequently arming them against the Assad government, setting off a long and blood civil war in the country. This ran concurrent with ISIS's declaration of a worldwide caliphate as they launched incursion into Iraq and Syria. Russia had intervened in the Syrian Civil War in 2015 and began launching strikes on ISIS positions in order to bolster Assad's forces. But Assad would continuously ignore Syria's ceasefire agreement and continues bombing and gassing Ghouta civilians. This put Russia in a difficult position as Syria's ally. Russia, in defense of a key ally in Syria tried to posture themselves as humane by helping the innocent civilians victimized by ISIS, but continuing to help Assad's regime would take a toll on their global reputation. This put Russia in a precarious position, but still nonetheless Russia's involvement helped further cultivate their reputation as a reliable ally. The US was hoping that Russia would back away from Assad and Syria because once that would happen, the United States would be able to assume full influence in the Middle East; something that would officially end the Cold War with Russia. But Russia's continued influence in the Middle East would trigger US intervention in eastern Europe in the hopes of keeping Russia distracted with issues closer to home and away from conflict in the Middle East. People had a misconception about Russia, and a militant aggressive reputation was often conferred upon them, but

in reality, they were afraid of the United States. The Korean War is a good example, when the US went hands-on helping S Korea, while Russia continued its proxy fighting in fear of getting into a direct confrontation with the US. The Syrian conflict was the beginning stages of the democrats' foray down the pro-war rabbit hole.

The Syrian Civil War that began in 2011 had involved numerous inquiries from the United Nations (UN), an entity not to be considered global enforcers. The UN was more of an assessment of situations in different countries. NATO, however, ultimately decides the outcome of geopolitics. The US and Western Europe were pretty much the undisputed leaders of it which—by default—makes them more powerful then the UN. The US disregarded seeking a UN resolution for Iraq before the invasion with no consequences. Who's going to punish US or UK? Regime change decree by the US for Iran and Syria still stands and the US was hoping that once Assad had gathered enough human rights violations, the US would go in and attack Syria and Russia would simply sit by and watch because of reluctance to have their sovereignty permanently aligned with the likes of a Syrian regime that targets children. Once Syria would have been stabilized with Assad out of the picture, the US would have become more assertive with Iran. The way things were going, the outcome looked as though it would have played out similar to the Reagan administration, with Russia ultimately conceding to the US, and the US becoming, once again, the undisputed leader around the Middle East and the world. Trump had so much luck with foreign affairs, getting N. Korea to talk, while Assad had the global reputation as the human rights violator. Trump was in a good position to weaken Russia's position in the Middle East. Prior to Obama's intervention in Syria, republicans like Mitt Romney tried to convey to the the US that Russia was America's number one foe, but at that time the democrats, still very much anti-war, refused to give credence to what Romney was saying. Many of the democrats thought it was pure non-sense that Russia would be America's number one foe. The idea was ultimately passed off as typical GOP war mongering.

After NATO intervened in Libya and Syria, reports about civilian casualties started coming to light. This would in effect set the stage for notions that the democrats and the republicans were a

uni-party, united in their view of military hegemony. But in response, proponents of the military industrial complex began to more assertively highlight the crimes of Assad's regime and Russia's military, while downplaying the casualties inflicted by the US airstrikes. Collateral damage is an unfortunate occurrence in geopolitical and military conflict. So many times, a military attempts to justify its actions that lead to civilian casualties simply as a part of unintended consequences. But leaders know, before any operation, what the probabilities of civilian casualties are and because of this, they have to be held "morally culpable" in some way. In this case, Russia and Syria cannot even attempt to play down the end result. It was known 'plain and simple' that civilians were going to be killed during an operation. What sort of intel would lead any high ranking military official into believing that the enemy personnel located near a marketplace where civilians gather would necessitate an order which would deliver a hailstorm of airstrikes to the area? These human rights violations had gone way too far and something should have been done. During the Obama Administration, the US was ready to declare war on Syria but hadn't taken any significant action, largely due in part to Obama wanting to maintain a peacemaker image typical of democrat politics. This turned out to be another cold war between Russia and the US. As long as Russia continued to back Assad, and the US continued to back the free Syrian army without taking any significant action against the Assad administration, civilian casualties were going to continue to pile up. Meanwhile, the republicans were urging Obama to provide aid to Ukraine against the rebels in eastern Ukraine who were backed by the Russian military. The idea was to keep Russia distracted from Middle East issues.

This Syrian conflict was getting more and more complicated after Turkey had got involved. Turkey had positive relations with Russia, while Erdogan, the president of Turkey, was clearly an unapologetic opportunist. It seemed like he would milk this cow dry. He, at the time, felt justified to take any land where Kurds were situated and many of them found refuge on the Syrian/Turkey border. Turkey has designated the Kurds as a force of terrorism, designating the Kurdish nationalist group called the PKK as a terrorist group. Erdogan remained bent on removing them away

from Turkey's borders, even if it required for Turkey's military to cross over into Syrian territory. But to what extent can Erdogan feel that Kurds were a threat? Can Erdogan also move his military into Northern Iraq based on that? How much land in Syria can he take without returning it to Assad before Russia gives him a warning, and yet Russia and Turkey were on good terms. This added another element to the Syrian situation that just added more confusion.

The Iraq military had already removed a large portion of Kurdish militants from oil rich parts of Northern Iraq and its unknown how much patience Iraq would have with Turkey crossing their borders to go after the Kurds. Erdogan was giving off this imperialist vibe that he would use anything to justify expansion. Iraq had just come off a hard fought battle with ISIS, and were in the process of trying to solidify the government. If Iraq objected to Turkey crossing their border, it wouldn't be long before Erdogan accuses the Iraq government of indirectly aiding PKK activity and terror planning in N. Iraq for which would be carried out in Turkey. This would further justify Erdogan's ambitions. Since Assad had his hands full and was basically a human rights violator at this point, it made no sense for Turkey to return any Syrian land taken from driving out Kurdish militants. But still, it had to raise some red flags for Iraq (even though Iraq was backed by US) that Erdogan might be tempted to do the same in N Iraq if the military was allowed to conduct operations there. It seems like any attack on PKK terrorists in N. Iraq was really no different than going to war against N. Iraq (Kurdistan). If Kurdistan was harboring the PKK, than how could Erdogan make any distinctions between the entire area of Kurdistan, and the PKK? One may have felt that Afrin, part of Syria which was grabbed by Turkey, would have to remain under Turkish military occupation until Assad would be removed from power. Leaving civilians there unprotected would be disastrous for them since Assad had shown no restraint when it came to bombing civilian areas. The problem was that without Russia or US involvement in some way, insurgency uprising would have remained a threat to the civilian population, potentially turning Syria into a Libya type of situation.

The Middle East conflict had become an all out Shiite vs Sunni War and would almost certainly be the absolute center of a global

conflict with US/Western Europe on the side of the Sunnis vs Eastern Europe/China/Russia on the side of the Shiites. While at first glance, the Middle East situation seems confusing with so much going on. However, when you narrow it down to Sunni and Shiite, the interconnectedness became more apparent. Right now it doesn't look good for Shiite Islam because of its ties to Assad, who was Alawite which was an offshoot of Shia that venerates Ali, the cousin of Muhammad. However, Sunni Islam had ties to ISIS and Al Qaeda.

Syria had been investigated before by the entire international community numerous times. Intelligence agencies from many countries had evidence and still has evidence that Assad was behind the chemical attacks. The OPCW was usually pretty reliable on inspection. It was the same organization that investigated Saddam's Iraq for weapons of mass destruction and found nothing. Its pretty clear that Syria launched chemical attacks against civilians. However, ISIS's presence and simultaneous use of chemical weapons against civilians allows for Syria to apply plausible deniability.

Initially, Trump, following his election, had the international backing and moral high ground over Assad and anyone who aligned themselves with him. Maybe there was some confirmation bias involved since investigations do tend suffer from this when gathering evidence, meaning they would throw out evidence that could lead to exoneration as opposed to evidence that would lead to implication of someone they were initially against and moreso someone who had a certain reputation. There was a likelihood that Assad did use gas in 2013 during the Obama Administration, as that was heavily investigated and confirmed by most of the international community, not just Israel’s allies. Russia even agreed upon a deal that would reduce Syria's chemical weapons. After that, though, it was possible that subsequent attacks were carried out by ISIS knowing that knowledge of Assad's previous actions using chemical weapons would be parlayed into future investigations having a certain amount of confirmation bias that would implicate Assad, no matter if he did it or not. Remember, ISIS did not go to Syria help the opposition. ISIS declared a worldwide caliphate and was going destroy everyone who didn't bow down to their brand of Islam (Sharia Law). They were just as much against Assad as they were

against the Syrian people and had targeted and killed lots of civilians in Syria without flinching an eye. One thing was for sure, there hadn't been as strong of an investigation of ISIS's involvement in these chemical weapons attack as there had been an investigation of Assad's involvement.

Slowly it became more apparent that Russia was not the power it has often been made out to be and was more afraid of the US than the US was afraid of Russia. One could have gathered that even back during the Korean war when US went troops on the ground while Russia stayed proxy. Besides, Russia was too poor to fund a war against the US and that's probably why they were using other means to disrupt the US. Russia was trying to stay out of Israel's conflict with Iran, however, it wasn't clear if Russia would hand over control of the air defense system to Syria. If that happened, it would have been easier for Iran to make a deal with Assad to use that defense system against Israeli fighter jets flying near Iran military bases in Syria.

Still and all, Russia was just not a country the US wanted to associate with in any way. They outrank all other nations when it comes to possibly being able to challenge US military, economic, and political standing in the world and would always be the number one focus of US intelligence/investigation. They were going no holds barred in ripping the US apart socially by infiltrating US institutions via spying, fake news social media postings, hacking, etc. Putin was a former KGB, so he was deeply involved in this covert form of attack. The US did not have the proper infrastructure against this barrage of Russian hackers/spies. It also didn't help that being anti-American was fostered by the left when Trump was president which was a dangerous prospect for the country, seeing that there were so many young impressionable disgruntled young men who want to leave a mark on this world by doing something destructively noteworthy.

In hindsight, Russia, through aid and diplomacy, was gaining influence throughout the entire Middle East. They were making friends with everyone, all sides of the conflict. It was very strategic on their part and would certainly change their economic future and later serve as a buffer against US sanctions that would be later applied after Russia's invasion of Ukraine in 2022. The danger of

Russia's growing influence in the Middle East was that if they manage to lure Saudi Arabia away from the United States, it would usher in a shift in the world order with their country at the helm, with maybe China second, and the US third in terms of national military/economic power. Russia was doing this without even having to let Middle Eastern refugees stay in their country. So for Russia, this was a win/win scenario. US ability to control its destiny and make decisions was credited in large part to its stature relative to other countries. When that dynamic changes, the country's self determination would be limited to approval and oversight from the greater power. For most people, this was not a big deal because the central idea of life was to live and let live. However, these shifts don't just stop, they keep going and its clear that Russia won't be satisfied until the US would be completely subjugated to them or least diminished enough to keep Russian leaders from fearing US policy regarding NATO's expansion. Ultimately, status is not important if everyone is just trying to stay within their domain and not trying to oppress or expand, but these days alot of countries were feeling justified, especially in terms of what the US may have opened the door for others to do.

Saudi Arabia faced international scrutiny when a US resident, Jamal Khashoggi, was extrajudicially murdered by Saudi officials in the Saudi consulate in Turkey. It is important to note that opposition to government in that part of the world was often backed by violence, assassinations, coup attempts, etc. So in that sense, it leaves administrations over there on edge when hearing or reading about criticism from those who disagree with policy. It can incite violence very quickly and administration was very aware of that. Khashoggi was planning to publish sensational revelations about Saudi war crimes in Yemen.

This dynamic, however, is a bit different in civilized, European based society right now because we don't hear much about coup attempts or violent overthrow, so our administrative bodies don't get as rattled when members of the population express disagreement with policy. That could change in the post Jan-6 world, with the US cracking down on dissent, fearing that hostile rhetoric may imply violent action. Not only that, with Russia having infiltrated US democracy the way they did with the election, and

China implanting chips into hardware for spying purposes, US administration's attitude to anti-government rhetoric may become even more assertive to prevent this type of covert non-violent aggression by China and Russia from evolving into something that could permanently cripple US democratic values.

Meanwhile, Iran had been firing cruise missiles at Saudi oil facilities. Oil facilities should always have radar because the best way to win any war was to cut off your enemy's access to oil and as long as there was aggression in the world, the possibility of such an attack as a first objective for any hostile nation had to be considered. Iran was denying responsibility. However, they've threatened to cut off Saudi oil supply/transport logistics numerous times in the past. Such threats wouldn't help Iran's believability here. For the West, Saudi, and Israel, Iran was the only obstacle to mid-east stability as they empower and fund almost all antagonism to Israel's existence. If anyone should desire Middle East peace, they would have to also desire some sort of strategy regarding how to deal effectively with Iran. Since Khomeini came to power in the late 70's, the US had consistently been determined not to compromise with Iran, at least until Obama. Lets say the Houthis, an Iranian proxy, did actually carry out the attack on Saudi’s oil facilities, it still links back to Iran, since Iran also supplies and aids the Houthi rebels in Yemen. Of course, US always had to calculate how Russia would respond in the case of launching any attack against Iran, which is why the US was adamant about fomenting a war in eastern Europe. Because lets face it, the most important factor for the US in the Middle East was their relationship with Saudi Arabia. However, the US had to be careful not to give off the impression of taking orders from the Saudis, but at the same time let the Saudis know that the US was in their corner as a major ally. No one can expect any mid-east peace as long as Iran continues its proxy endeavors to remove the state of Israel.

In terms of Iran or any country's determination to develop a nuclear arsenal, there seems to be no way to circumvent any country's efforts to develop itself in that manner. There would be no way to stop Iran from developing its nuclear arsenal without the use of force, but there is no way to justify attacking on those grounds when other countries had successfully developed their

nuclear arsenal without resistance. Attacking simply on the grounds of fear would create a dangerous ripple effect and set a global precedent that makes preemptive strikes from fear alone justifiable. Yes, while its' a scary thought of what could happen if Iran had nuclear weapons, but that fear wouldn't justify a preemptive based solely on that. The only to way implicate and act against Iran for its nuclear development would be for the UN to designate Hezbollah as a terror group. If that happens, all of Hezbollah's affiliates would inherit that same status, including Iran. In that case Iran would face regime change in the country and its threat to mid-east peace would effectively end. The way Iran had been acting in terms of its aggression towards Saudi Arabia and Israel leads to Iran actually working against itself, because now any action against Iran doesn't have to revolve around the nuclear aspect, but simply around its hostility to the existence of globally recognized nation states like Israel, which would in itself give justification for a military response against Iran, which would then provide an avenue for that same military response to also go ahead and stop its nuclear development. NATO's nuclear deterrence policy allows NATO countries to develop nuclear weapons as a deterrence to non-NATO countries who were looking to develop them. However, international right to self determination gives a nation or people the right to develop itself politically and nationally based on principles of equal rights and opportunity. So, there was some conflict between NATO's deterrence policy and international policy of right to self determination. With Israel, FDR's lend-lease policy comes into play that allows the US to supply any nation whose defense directly relates to the US's defense, which therefore automatically makes NATO's nuclear deterrence policy applicable with regard to Israel's nuclear weapons stockpile compared to Iran's.

In 2019, Putin had offered to sell S-400 missiles to Saudi Arabia in order to help their bolster defenses. Russia was literally playing both sides of the conflict in open view. Russia gave Syria the same missiles to possibly ward off Israeli attacks on Syrian territory targeting Iran bases, which was sort of a defacto Russia/Iran alliance against Israel. Russia and Iran were normally strategic allies, but now Russia was offering that same defense to an enemy

of Iran. We were beginning to see why Middle East nations don't want outside influence. The ones who often tout an alliance with one nation could just as easy tout an alliance with an enemy of that nation, and then simply play both sides. It's almost as if Russia was insulting the intelligence of Muslim countries. It's like England—they provide aid to the Palestinians in Gaza and at the same time provide arms support to Israel. That makes this situation all the more disconcerting. If the Saudis accept Russia's offer, would the US rebuke Saudi Arabia the way they did Turkey after Turkey bought the Russian Missiles? There was a push to remove Turkey from NATO because of that. It is clear that the Saudis had more clout in terms of its independent decision making, however, there was no way the US would not express a significant measure of disappointment should the Saudis accept Russia's assistance. Russia had been courting Saudi Arabia for years and was probably the biggest threat to the United States in terms of the US's status in the world in relation to other nations. Russia's ultimate goal was to lure Saudi Arabia away from both the United States and the US dollar.

In late 2019, the Trump administration, leading up to the assassination of Iranian General Solemani, had wanted to act against Iran after the missile strike on Saudi oil facilities, but Iran warned the US on retaliation as it continued to deny any role in the attack. US intel had evidence that the attacks originated from Iran, but the political climate in the US was such that gathering support for a military operation against Iran was untenable. The democrats at this time was adamant against any policy that could lure the US into another major conflict. But the US military was afraid that if the US did not retaliate on behalf of Saudi Arabia, then Russian diplomatic efforts with Saudi Arabia would be able to use that lack of action on their part to their advantage in their attempts to steer Saudi Arabia away from the United States. The Russians would be able to present the idea to Saudi Arabia that the US was not viable enough to directly confront the enemies of its allies. It's unlikely that Russia could offer to aid Saudi Arabia militarily, seeing that Iran is a critical ally of Russia, but they could still nonetheless point to their efforts with Syria as proof that such intervention was a part of Russian foreign policy and an indication of Russia's reliability as a pertinent ally. With Russia courting Saudi Arabia diplomatically,

Saudi Arabia ultimately ended up having a lot of clout and leverage, which put the US in a precarious position. The US would not be able to allow Russia to demonstrate that they were more willing than the United States to cater to the whims of its allies. Russia could easily sever ties with Iran in exchange for close ties with Saudi Arabia. a prospect that would change the current order of the world. Offering the Saudis its missile defense system could be Russia's first step in doing just that.

Russia's ties with Israel and Assad was odd, and it shows that Russia was not really too intent on playing sides accordingly to how everything lines up as far as conflict in the Middle East was concerned. This lack of prudence on Russia's part was how the US could respond to Russia's courtship of Saudi Arabia—by noting to Saudi Arabia how Russia was not concerned about dealing with any particular dynamic that affects the status of their allies. The reason one can gather that Russia would easily throw all of its eggs into Saudi Arabia was because Russia knows that US economic infrastructure was held up solely by the Saudis selling oil for US dollars, which in itself raises the global demand for the currency, which in turn allows the US to continue to borrow money and stimulate the economy. Turning that off would have dire consequences for the US from an economic standpoint, as the US was already in dire straits as far as the national debt was concerned, and we still don't know how sustainable US shale oil is, which was why Saudi-US relations remain important even as the US overtakes Saudi Arabia in Oil exports. Since Saudi Arabia had significant control over OPEC, which sells oil for US dollars, Russia overtaking the US in diplomatic relations with Saudi Arabia would also constitute Russia overtaking any influence the US had on OPEC via Saudi Arabia. OPEC controls almost 80 percent of the world's oil supply. If Saudi Arabia moves away from the US dollar at the request of Russia, its likely that all other member nations would follow suit. To circumvent this, the US could maybe join OPEC and try to exert some influence as a top oil exporter and keep member nations content with selling their oil for US dollars.

Russia did the bulk of the fighting against ISIS. US forces however did real well at locating key individuals. The US places a greater emphasis on the head of organizations as opposed to the

body. There was a former ISIS member/Saddam loyalist who came out and said that these organizations fall apart when the leadership breaks down, and not so much when de-radicalization attempts try to dissuade incoming recruits. The problem though was still the fact that the US invaded Iraq. That decision still raises questions to this day. Much of ISIS's infrastructure was maintained by Saddam's military personnel and disgruntled Iraqi Sunnis who were feeling ostracized by the current Iraqi government. The war in Iraq and not finding those weapons of mass destruction was why ISIS would likely grow another head at some point, with that head stemming mainly from the demographic of disgruntled Sunni minorities/Saddam loyalists in Iraq. They would always be able to use the war in Iraq as justification. Al Qaeda had somewhat distanced itself from ISIS even though ISIS did had remnants of the Al Qaeda of Iraq started by Abu Musab al-Zarqawi. In any case, the only de-radicalization strategy to circumvent a resurgence of ISIS was to work on Iraq's policy toward the Sunni minorities and help the Sunni minorities find some contentment with the Iraqi government, otherwise Jihad would remain a threat to Middle East stability.

The civil war in Syria waged on in 2019 and the battle for a Syrian town pitted Turkey against the Assad Regime. It was only a matter of time before Assad would step in. If Turkey was to become greedy, all of Erdogan's progress in driving the Kurds back outside of and away from that safe radius at the Turkey/Syrian border would become undone. Maybe Erdogan thinks because he was currently cooperating with Russia at the border, he could expand that radius a little further. Still and all, Assad was going to place limits on just how far Turkey can go. The last thing Turkey needed was for the Kurds to gain more military assurance from the Assad regime, and it didn’t help Turkey's cause that they (Turkey) was still backing the anti-Assad rebels. If Erdogan became overzealous, the Kurds would become a greater threat to his administration and country, much greater than Erdogan's current outlook of them as being linked to the PKK(Kurdistan worker's party), an internationally known terrorist group.

Its hard to delineate Erdogan's intentions with the Kurds, whether its to neutralize or genocide. As of 2019, one can say the

Kurdish threat to Erdogan was neutralized, especially if he had control over that small radius between the Turkish/Syrian border. It would not help his cause to feel that he should have the right to follow the Kurds wherever they go, thereby antagonizing his neighbors along the way. If Erdogan was going to believe that every pro-Kurdish group had ties with the PKK, then how can one assume that he was not trying cleanse the Middle East entirely of Kurdish people? There is reason to call it that, but many in the international community think this was the case. His fear was not unfounded. However, from a strategic standpoint, getting too overzealous could provide an impetus for states/regimes to back these PKK offshoots, which would be even more problematic for the internal security of Turkey than the idea of an offshoot of the PKK existing somewhere outside of Turkey but not a threat to Turkey. Erdogan's fears stem from evidence that the YPG in Syria, which led the SDF in the fight against ISIS and the Turkey Backed Syrian rebels, was simply an offshoot of the PKK. The US was aware that the YPG was an offshoot of an internationally known terror group, but helped the YPG anyway due to the growing threat of the ISIS caliphate.

In retrospect, there was no need for Assad to bombard those areas and risk more civilian casualties. The US had already withdrawn from the conflict and the Syrian Democratic forces had already began discourse with Assad about the Kurdish situation. The opposition was effectively neutralized. There was no need to risk more civilian deaths. There was no existential threat to the Assad regime with ISIS defeated, the US withdrawal, and SDF cooperation.

Meanwhile Iran continued to provoke the US, striking US personnel in Iraq via its proxies. Iran, through rebel militias, had carried out rocket attacks for months, prompting the US to deploy more troops to the region. After numerous provocations, Iran's Gen. Soleimani would be killed in a US airstrike at Baghdad airport in early 2020. This was met with widespread condemnation from the democrats, who had been vehemently anti-war throughout Trump’s tenure. They were fearful of possible war with Iran. The strike was done as a reprisal to a Shiite militia rocket attack on a US contractor and other US military personnel on an Iraq military base. This was a major strike by the US and would heighten tensions

in the region. Gen Soleimani was, according to some, the second most powerful person in Iran. According to the US, he was planning to attack US diplomats and other US representatives in Iraq. The dynamics between Iran and US had now changed from political/diplomatic to military, similar to how Trump altered the dynamic between North Korea and the United States. In both cases of Iran and North Korea, the democrats and the detractors of President Trump were very sympathetic to both regimes. The era of containment was over and we were seemingly headed for another major conflict in the Middle East. The Trump administration pulled out of the Iran Nuclear deal and applied sanctions against Iran, which in turn may have been a catalyst to Iran increasing its supply of arms to its Shiite militant channels in Yemen and Lebanon through Syria and Iraq. Retaliation could have through its proxy channels. However the US was trying to signal to Iran that any proxy maneuvers by Iran would be met with direct confrontation by the US. Trump decided to strike Iran after a positive meeting with Russia, a meeting which sort of disarmed Russia for the moment.

The anti-war attitude of the democrats when Trump was in office gave off the impression that they were in fact going to be front and center in getting the US military out of these endless wars. This was key in Biden's eventual election. When Biden, shortly thereafter, became hostile in rhetoric towards Russia, many, even myself, were confused because we had the impression that there was going to be a concerted effort to avoid military conflict at almost any cost. It became even more perplexing when many of Biden's supporters who were also vehemently anti-war when Trump was in office, would also jump on this pro-war bandwagon after Biden's election, even entertaining and welcoming the thought of a nuclear war with Russia. It was clear that it was not about being anti-war when it came to the perspective of democrats and leftists. It was simply a game of contrarianism. In 2017, when Trump sent heavy weapons to Ukraine, the left leaning media strongly opposed the idea and thus became anti-Ukraine, publishing reports that Ukraine had a Neo-nazi problem. But when the quid-pro-quo scandal happened in 2019 in which Trump threatened to withhold weapons from Ukraine in exchange for their cooperation in investigating Biden's Burisma ties while he was Vice President,

Trump's detractors made a 180 degree turn on Ukraine, becoming in favor of weaponizing the country and encouraging Ukraine to stand firm against Russia, regardless of any proposals to negotiate. The democrats had lost sight of how the Neo-cons were behind starting a war in Ukraine, and consigned Trump's pro-Putin approach to a pro-Russian GOP narrative that was not consistent with fact or reality. Democrats going down this rabbit hole and unwittingly aligning with the pro-war Neo-conservatives led many to uphold the idea that the democrats and the republicans were a uni-party.

When it came to Iran, there was alot of apprehension on the part of many in the US concerning Iran because the US had a history of military endeavors in the Middle East that did not quite pan out as intended,and in some cases may have even exacerbated problems. There was no way for anyone to expect the US to allow Iran to impose its will in the Middle East, especially when it came to the safety of US personnel. All countries had their red line, and both sides had effectively crossed the other's. When that happens, peace becomes a very difficult thing to conjure up. Much of US antagonism to Iran was in response to Iran's antagonism to US/Israel as Iran was open in their mantra of death to America/death to Israel. The US takes this very seriously. Come to find out, there were Hezbollah networks not just in the Middle East, but also in Latin America and Africa. Iran may could try to further enable Hezbollah's operations in those areas. The world had become a more dangerous place than it already was.

Iran's strategy of plausible deniability, however, had to be taken into consideration. All those attacks on US bases in 2019 could not be undeniably linked to them by other than the fact that the rockets used were also the same rockets used by the Houthis in Yemen. For this reason, Iran had been able to garner sympathy and because of this plausible deniability strategy by Iran, the evidence that the US had for the imminent attack that they were averting by attacking Soleimani directly may not be substantial enough for the already skeptical public sentiment towards the Trump administration. While the US was not the shining moral example because of mistakes in the past up to now, one still had to be vigilant that one's own sentiment isn't playing into the hands of an open enemy to the US. Familiarity breeds contempt, and many Americans were

entirely too familiar and frustrated with US policy, but at the same time, its important not to let the whole "grass greener on the other side" aspect cloud one's greater discernment.

Meanwhile, the Syrian government continued to seem more concerned about territory than they were about civilians. Luckily Russia had relations with both Turkey and Syria, which could in itself restrain Syria from simply launching gas attacks on both the Hayat Tahrir Al Sham (HTA) enclaves and Turkish military without concern for the civilian population. Turkey had remained conciliatory with Russia, even though Russian forces had killed Turkish forces in Syria via friendly fire in the past. For the US to get involved in the conflict, it would mean they would have to fight against the very people whom they were allied with during the Syrian Civil War—the Kurds. Turkey's involvement automatically places the Kurds with Assad in terms of alliance and if the US sides with Turkey against the Kurds, it would continue to raise questions and scrutiny toward US foreign policy. However, even this conundrum doesn't change the dire implication of Assad continuing his operations in Syria. The SDF was made up of not only Kurds, but other Arab militias who may either become pro Assad, or in the more likely sense, join the HTA against Assad and all foreign presence in Syria, but nonetheless accept aid from Turkey.

HTA was originally Al Nusra Front, but broke affiliation with Al Qaeda around 2016 and changed their name. US getting involved would depend on the scope of Turkey's aid towards the rebels and figuring out exactly where the Kurds stand in all of this. For Israel, the decision was easier because the most of the PLA (Palestinian Liberation Army), formerly the military arm of the PLO (an Israel-designated terror organization), was largely situated in Syria to protect the Assad regime. For Israel, a fortifying of the Assad regime raises the likelihood of a confrontation of between Israel and Syria since Syria had promised to reclaim every inch of Syria, which would include the Golan Heights.

ISIS and Hayat Tahrir al-Sham had gained strength in Syria. The difference between HTA and ISIS was that ISIS was operating on declared caliphate, while HTA was largely opposed to foreign influence in Syria, namely the Russians. Some of the Assad rebels who fought in the Syrian civil war were now working for Erdogan as

mercenaries in Libya. Subterranean warfare was really the problem in Syria. ISIS was able to lay siege to large swaths of territory in Iraq and Syria back in 2014 using those tactics. Clearly, airstrikes were not the answer since ISIS was still operating today even after Russian and US ariel intervention. Now, ISIS was using the subterranean warfare to access critical oil and gas reserves. There was no military solution in Syria. Many agree that the UN had to support a pro-Syrian agenda focused on getting aid into the country. This is easier said than done, however. Assad still had to work out tensions with Turkey; tensions which stem from Assad providing refuge to the Kurds and YPG militants, an offshoot of the PKK.

The situation in Syria had gotten out of control. Raising tensions with Turkey would backfire on Assad. After vowing to keep US soldiers in Syria, President Trump decided in October of 2019 to withdraw the remaining US troops from Syria. In recent years up onto that point, the US had been launching airstrikes in Syria and also kept a number ground troops stationed there in the fight against ISIS. One of the US's closest partners during the campaign were the Kurdish fighters, thousands of whom have been killed in Syria since 2014. They were leading a coalition of multi-ethnic fighters called the Syrian Democratic Forces. In 2019, however, Turkey was preparing to launch an offensive in the region to repel the Kurdish presence near Turkey's border. The Kurdish militia serving alongside the US and leading the Syrian Democratic Forces in Syria was known as the YPG, a group that Turkey's president, Recep Erdogan, believes is simply an offshoot of the PKK, a group that both the US and Turkey has designated as a terrorist group. And the fact that the US was allied with the group during the Syrian campaign created a tension between the US and Turkey that became unsustainable. Thus Erdogan made it clear to Trump that Turkey was going to attack the Syrian border regardless of US presence. After a phone call with the Turkish president on this matter, Trump ordered the removal of the remaining 1000 US troops in Syria, and many US soldiers felt as though they were abandoning their closest ally and leaving them to be slaughtered by the Turkish army. The US would later confirm that the Kurdish fighters they cooperated with in Syria were an offshoot of the PKK, a US designated terrorist

group. All things considered, the string of treaty violations and abandonment of partnership obligations conducted by the Trump administration, paved the way for the irreversible loss of trust between the United States and overseas partners. This loss of trust would reach a tipping point during the next administration to take office in Washington D.C.

No country was completely free of domestic militant resistance, and in Syria after the US withdrew their troops and after ISIS was defeated, there was no existential threat to Assad's government. He wanted to eliminate every ounce of contention without realizing that such a prospect was impossible. He continued to act without regard for human civilian life and was on the verge of being charged with war crimes. Not sure how many more civilians the Syrian government had to kill before the international community says enough was enough.

The US would bargain for Turkey to cut ties with Russia and also de-arm themselves of those Russian missiles they currently had. The US was also careful about getting too involved because of the Kurdish issue. Not a problem for Turkey since Germany was now the undisputed leader of the EU. Germany, even under military constraints from WWII, can act militarily to defend a NATO ally. Germany was also the number 1 economy in Europe and had the ability to fund any major conflict. Of course, this was all if Russia launches offensives against Turkey. Russia would not attack a NATO ally. Russia had a lot going for them diplomatically and it would have been surprising if they would let Syria cause them to lose all their international diplomatic gains over the past 2-3 years. However, if Russia could not convince Assad to de-escalate, there could be some major diplomatic consequences for Russia. The concept of over-reaching doesn't seem to apply in military conflict, but yet it had an overt significant implication throughout history.

Turkey was threatening to allow Syrian refugees to go into Europe if NATO didn’t act to protect them from Russian aggression. Russia could be applying plausible deniability about their attacks on Turkish troops. However, another migrant crisis would challenge the stability of some European countries who had experienced a surge in far right violence. Germany, should they intervene, would attack Russia directly especially if the global

markets continue to get pounded over the coronavirus lockdowns. If Germany took the lead on aiding Turkey, they would likely dismiss all WWII NATO constraints and apply full military independence and use their monetary reserves for the adequate military spending needed to resolve the Syrian crisis. The US could help, but would likely not send troops back to Syria to fight alongside Turkey and face a situation where they eventually end up fighting against the Kurds after having helped them in the fight against ISIS. Most of Europe had given Germany the green light to build up their military, and Trump had put considerable pressure on Germany to increase their military spending.

Syria and Russia's justification was that they needed to drive out the terrorists, but killing civilians in the process seemed to defeat that purpose. Germany and Belgium had both confronted Russia about the crisis regarding civilian casualties and could have ended up providing support to Erdogan if Russia and Syria continued to ignore their demands for ceasefire in Idlib.

Notwithstanding, it may have been a bit premature for Erdogan to use coercion to try and get NATO to respond especially with Germany and Belgium already at serious odds with Russia over what was happening in Idlib. Countries don't like to feel they were being coerced into anything and would usually do everything to save face in that regard. Erdogan could have lobbied for more military assistance from the EU and NATO without resorting to coercion. Turkey would not be able to withstand an onslaught from both Syria and Russia's forces who would go to any lengths to reclaim Syrian territory no matter the cost. NATO wouldn’t allow ego to keep them from providing the necessary aid to Turkey that would help circumvent more civilian casualties. Idlib was now a humanitarian crisis. Furthermore, it was a good sign that the Kurds were also urging the UN to deal with the situation in Idlib, which could lead to the US jumping back into action if the rest of NATO won't help Turkey. Of course, the US would have to make clear to all that their help was strictly for helping to mend the situation in Idlib and not for helping Turkey go after the the Kurds.

Syria alone would not be able to run roughshod over the Turkish army. They would need substantial Russian support. Erdogan seems like a fearless leader who doesn't pull punches and

doesn't make supplications. However, there seems to be a great deal of opposition within his own administration regarding Syria. Because of that, talks with Russia could have easily led to a solution to the Syria/Turkey conflict. They key issues for Russia during such talks would have been Turkey's ties to the Syrian rebel groups and the HTA, and for Turkey, the key issue during the talks would be Syria's ties to YPG/PKK. There would have had to be some promises made by each side to cut their ties to the respective groups, which is not as easy as it sounds. But judging from the internal conflict within the Turkish administration, Erdogan may likely be advised to compromise in this regard. I doubt he would listen, he seemed intent to using force to keep Syria in check, and not diplomacy. In the event of Syria's lack of care, a red line could have been crossed and lead to a full on Turkish invasion regardless of Russia's presence.

Erdogan's main objective had always been to get the Kurds as far away from Turkey as possible. He could also be doing this to put more pressure on both NATO and the US to side with Turkey. He wants to push the Kurds out of Syria and into Iraq or anywhere where they would not be welcomed. If Syria and Russia would agree on that point, then Turkey would have been willing to compromise with Syria and Russia.

The Hayat Tahrir al Sham(HTA) was the only formidable opposition (in Idlib) to the Assad regime. The SDF had been been in correspondence with the Assad regime and had abandoned the resistance. The Syrian Democratic forces(SDF) were made up of many YPG(PKK offshoot) soldiers, so Turkey was definitely not backing them. There was no information on who these Turkish backed rebels were. There was controversy over this same dynamic when the rebels were being aided by the US during the Syrian civil war. There was a major issue with the US backed Syrian rebels allowing much of that aid to end up in the hands of ISIS. Many of the rebels were either negotiating non-aggression with ISIS or joining them.

Russia's involvement definitely emboldened Assad and kept him from having to answer to an international tribunal for his actions. But Syria was in a precarious position. Israel had been striking Iranian targets in Syria for years. While Syria was trying to

stay out of this aggression, it would only take some nudging from Iran for Syria to completely defend all of its airspace. Syria had high powered Russian anti-aircraft at its disposal and if the Iranians should, in some unfortunate scenario, gain access to the weapons, it could lead to escalation between Syria/Iran/Russia and Israel/US/Turkey After a top Iranian nuclear scientist was assassinated, things were getting nasty. This was a dangerous containment strategy applied by Israel. Aggression only further exacerbates Iran's urgency for nuclear weapons. Sad, its came to this—assassinating non-combatants. Israel, even when Khomeini came to power in the late 70s, remained open to better relations with Iran. However, those days were over. After years of repeated death threats from Iran, Israel was now on the brink of a direct conflict with Iran. Nuclear deterrence was not that easy. Technically any country that fuels its power grid on nuclear energy had the capability of enriching its Uranium by either extracting the necessary amount of U-235 or extracting Plutonium 239 after Uranium 239 beta decays. The knowledge to produce a nuclear bomb was as readily available as harry potter. So where does one draw the line? This was not good because it sets a new precedent in global conflict, where it becomes lawful for non-combatants to be targeted for murder by state-sponsored agencies, even within conflicts where the countries were not officially at war. The scariest thing was that domestic dissidents now had an angle that would provide them plausible deniability if they should decide to orchestrate an event in which these state-sponsored agencies can be designated the scapegoat. Public sentiment was at the moment heavily steered away from trusting these agencies as being in the best interest of the public. This was mainly due to allegations that villainizes them. This assassination of an Iranian nuclear scientist just further exacerbates the lack of trust and opens a Pandora's box. The UN needs to lay down some rules fast before this gets out of hand.

Obama's intervention in Syria by helping foment a civil war led to a new dynamic between pro-war Neo cons and anti-war democrats. The media would find themselves having to report on Syria in a way that highlights Assad's terror, but downplays the insidious role of the US in further escalating the conflict. Whereas

before when the democrats were usually quick to point out US military aggression when the operations were backed and supported by the GOP, but now that Obama, a democrat, was conducting continued military interventions, the media had to be sure to keep the focus on the need and justification for the US to remain on the attack. The democrats were heavily pro-Russian back in 2012 because their political opposition was heavily anti-Russian. In fact, this dynamic has a long-standing historical back drop. The red scare back in the 1950s was initiated by a republican senator named Joseph McCarthy and created a movement within the republican framework called McCarthyism. The goal was to go after left wing individuals. It was typical at that time to accuse leftists as having ties to the Russian government. But somewhere during Trump's presidency, this dynamic began to change where left-wingers were now in line with McCarthyism paranoia.

The complexities of the Middle East conflict presents scenarios such as when two sides are fighting alongside each other against a common enemy. This was similar to how the Iran-backed Mahdi army and Al Qaeda of Iraq were fighting together against the US invasion of Iraq. There was no link connecting the Iran -backed Mahdi army group with the Al Qaeda of Iraq militants even though both were launching attacks against US forces. As a result, the Mahdi army was never designated as a terror group by the UN (Al Qaeda was a UN designated terrorist group). Another example were the US-backed forces in Syria who were fighting against Assad and who allowed US weapons to get into the hands of ISIS fighters who were also fighting against Assad. Its complicated mess over there, but groups had to be careful because any evidence of coordination with a UN designated terror group automatically inserts that group as a terror affiliate. Its a deadly program since anyone on that UN designated terror list garners no entitlement to human rights or war policy protections, hence the continuous and ruthless US drone program deployed over there to go after any and all terrorist operatives and links.

The US needed to figure out foreign policy. Obviously, no one should want to support regimes that carry out terror on their own people, but don't make the situation worse. Syria was utter failure for the US. Not only did Assad stay in power, but countless people

loss their lives as a result of the Obama administration instigating civil war and unrest over there. There was a way to enact deterrence on despots and tyrannical or brutal leaders without having to put the inhabitants there in a perilous situation. The Obama administration did the same in Libya and now that place is nothing but a training ground for militants. Officials should let the leaders who violate human rights face a UN tribunal, and not make everyone suffer by turning the country into a war zone of human atrocity. That seems counter intuitive to actually trying to help. Half the time the soldiers don't even know why they're fighting. The US needs to sit down and draw up a foreign policy that at the very least makes some sort of sense and one that keeps civilians in mind. If they're just too ruthless to do it for the sake of civilians, then at least do it for the morale of the soldiers.

There was no deterring Iran and because of the sympathy they garnered from the Democratic Party in the United States after the assassination of Gen. Solemani, Iran would steadily gain more international support. Its likely that they were aware of this, and would simply continue to incite Israel with hostile maneuvers as a result, making Israel look like the aggressor. The same was happening in Gaza, where militants were firing at Israel to provoke an Israeli response and thus garner more international support. In the 2021 Gaza War, the media defined a moral equivalency between Israel and Hamas. Hamas is a US/Israel-designated terror group, but after the 2021 Gaza war in which Hamas would fire 4000 rockets into Israeli territory, the media and the democrats had taken on a very supportive tone by downplaying the nature of the terror group and consigning them to being a defensive entity. Right now, its about funding and greater support for Iran and Hamas, so Israel's defense sector had to be careful, especially the Mossad.

Chapter 11: Terror groups

ISIS recruiting platform was its strongest asset and the terror group would forever be a residual effect of the war in Iraq. The majority of them were Saddam loyalists and would not stop until they regain —at the very least—Iraq. The US tried to mend the blowback from the war in Iraq by advising the now mostly Shiite Iraq government to accommodate the Sunni minority. However, many of the Sunnis decided to choose the militant path. Consequently, the US would have to decide their policy because if they continue a hard-line stance against Iran and Syria, they would find themselves unwittingly aiding the ISIS cause. If they vehemently oppose ISIS, then the US would have to let go of some of their anti-Assad, anti-Iran policy. This would obviously defeat the whole purpose of their last six years in the region, but would drastically lower the odds of anymore ISIS resurgences. It's a very precarious situation over there in the Middle East with no cut and dry solution. ISIS had had plenty of time to become more efficient at evading air-strikes, and there was no way to eliminate the small pockets of ISIS operatives without going troops on the ground. Thanks to the war in Iraq, ISIS would easily be able to continue finding sympathizers to aid their cause. Luckily, their early links to Al Qaeda of Iraq automatically designated them an international terror organization, otherwise they would have no trouble convincing potential recruits that they were freedom fighters. A lot was riding on how Iraq embraced the Sunni minority since their level of acceptance of the new regime was key to mitigating the chances of disillusionment and alienation which causes people to seek out and court those radical outsider groups looking for new members.

As ISIS remained in small pockets in Syria, a Syrian ex-Officer had been convicted in first trial of Assad regime torture. This would serve as a deterring factor for any government looking to abuse their power, but at the same time embolden protesters around the world to push the envelope. The Obama administration's decision to aid dissent and violent escalation in Syria and Libya only set a precedent that might apprehend the US from fully being able to put down uprisings in their own country, due to a fear that over-aggression on the part of the state might allow opposition to garner

foreign support. Protesters become emboldened when they know foreign support would be available. There were hints of this fear on January 6th 2021, when protesters could be seen being escorted into the capitol building. Since 2020, US law enforcement had been apprehensive about engaging violent protest movements, often allowing disruptors to impose their will in destroying property. This also occurred during many of the BLM riots. This protocol of passive observance on the part of law enforcement was a result of US policy of justifying military intervention or regime change against regimes that carried out crackdowns on dissent. This had become the approach of US foreign policy. This was the methodology the US state dept applied in Ukraine in 2014, using Yanucovych's aggressive crackdown on protesters to justify the US support of a coup against the pro-Russian government. They also applied this dynamic in Libya and Syria, pointing to violent crackdowns against dissent by the Gaddafi and Assad administrations during the Arab Spring in 2011 as justification for the Obama administration to assert regime change. This would end being another rabbit hole that the United States was forced to inhabit. Thus in order to avoid appearing hypocritical, the US would allow protesters to impose their will on public infrastructure, for fear of the same condemnation that they themselves applied against regimes that used force to put down dissent. We may find that going forward, protest movements in the United States will become more and more emboldened and brazen.

While the Assad regime carried out war crimes, the US was responsible for escalating the situation over there—making the problem worse and then on top of that, abandoning the situation, leaving those they agreed to help at the mercy of Assad. The US had no principles whatsoever when it comes to mid-east policy. Had the US taken that into account from the start, their inability to hold up their end of an agreement, there would be less casualties in Syria. Assad would have carried out aggression, but much less because there would not have been a civil war. The US had a tendency to act first and think later. Both the Bush and Obama administration proves why presidents should never listen to generals. Remember most people join the military so they can kill without having to go to prison. That's just a fact.

Anyone wondering why the US had re-deployed troops to Syrian oil fields, even as of 2022 and 2023 after the US pulled out of Syria. It was mainly to keep ISIS at bay. A key element in warfare is securing the oil and gas fields. Once an army loses access to the oil supplies, it becomes near impossible for them to power their military equipment—logistical or otherwise. Since the Middle East was a treasure trove of oil, it becomes much more difficult—especially over there—to fully neutralize any enemy since the enemy would eventually find a way to access the much needed fuels. ISIS's propaganda machine continuously allows them to recruit new members, which is why he unjustified war in Iraq was problematic in this regard. As a result, someone would have to reach out to the Sunni minority in Iraq in order to cut off ISIS's reinforcement valve. The more the Sunnis become alienated in Iraq, the more likely it would be that they consider doing Jihad to avenge the war in Iraq.

It was obvious the gas fields were the main modus operandi of ISIS in Syria. Those areas in Syria should have been on high alert. ISIS was operating underground and conducting surprise ambushes on regime soldiers. And its only small number of ISIS militants pulling off these attacks. This prolonged conflict was setting the stage for a new type of warfare: Subterranean warfare. It's obvious that the even larger powers had no real answer on how to battle underground forces. This type of warfare had been effective for centuries. Back during the Arab invasions in the 7th century, monks found that they could successfully evade Arab forces. Back in WWII, the Japanese were effective in building underground fortification, and so were the Chinese. The Vietnamese during the Vietnam war was possibly the best example of how effective underground fortifications were against air power. Many of the larger powers really had no answer for this type of defense. What ISIS was doing was bringing notice to it. Most nations in the Middle East already had these underground structures in place and would only be emboldened against the stronger nations the longer ISIS was able to survive by simply making underground tunnels. Israel and the US were working on technology that would allow them to detect these underground tunnels, and if they are successful then we may see end to the prolonged conflict in the Middle East. If not, then we can expect that everyone there would pursue self determination

without regard for another country's superior airpower.

The conundrum of Iran is that they are a major force in keeping ISIS from spreading throughout the region, and in do so, they were able to garner more political influence in Iraq and Syria. What Iran began doing in Syria was similar to what the Wahhabis did in the late 90's in Afghanistan and Northern Pakistan—set up an anti-western indoctrination system much like the Sunni madrassas that were set up in Pakistan and Afghanistan before 9/11. Iran refused to let go of their death to US/death to Israel ideology which would continue to fuel conflict in the region. It's believed by many Sunnis that the Shiite imam (faith) is weak. Iran's moves would certainly effect how Saudi Arabia handles its own foreign policy.

At least the US and Israel somewhat concedes to the international pressure to get armed forces to reduce civilian casualties. The Syrian regime armed forces, however, just flat out seemed to ignore it all. At the same time, how far was opposition to Assad allowed to go as far what they felt needed to be done to remove him from power? How hypocritical would it be for a nation to march into Syria against the Syrian army for the sake of removing Assad, only to discover that they themselves were now engaging in the same brutal tactics that imperil civilians—tactics that they themselves lobbied against. Now all of a sudden, the end justifies the means? There were so many state actors from the US, UK, and in the Middle East that would never be tried and convicted for war crimes. Oftentimes, there isn't much one can do except get the conflict to settle down, get the situation stabilized, and allow history to remember what happened so that it doesn't get repeated. It was a horrible situation in Syria, but making the wrong move in attempting to alter the scenario could exacerbate the very thing one was trying to stop. In fact, it already had. The only effective deterrent that seemed to keep these aggressive leaders in check was continued international exposure. It does have a deterring effect on policy and decision making. This exposure has to come from and be cited from an international body, or an objective source. Because of their over-involvement and mistakes in the Middle East, the US had lost a lot of their pedigree as far as being able to expose these injustices. In fact, people were more likely to disbelieve the US on mid-east issues because of the whole war in Iraq fiasco. In this

regard, they had to be careful in their approach because any charges they bring on state actors in the Middle East could work against their own purposes in rooting out and correcting injustices.

There was no way for an outside force to adopt a humanitarian strategy in Syria and at the same time, push forward with an overthrow agenda there. History shows that embarking on this overthrow strategy—especially as an outside force—only serves to strengthen the ties between the tyrannical leader and the people he governs. This was the case with NK, Iran, Cuba, etc. These regimes had only grown stronger as a result of the outside antagonism. The only feasible option was through empowering a rebel force from within, but the drawback of this plan was obviously catastrophic for the inhabitants. Libya, Syria, Chile(overthrow of Allende government), all of these had led to severe human catastrophes and unnecessary loss of life. Obviously Israel had to be concerned about any intent by Syria to reclaim the Golan Heights. It's not known how much Iran had offered Syria as far as support goes for such an operation, but it is known that Hezbollah militants and Palestinian fighters(ex-PLA) were working with the Syrian army in Syria. In fact, Iran was smuggling arms to Hezbollah operatives in Syria for transport to Houthi fighters in Yemen. Turkey at some point was going to address both US/Israel's lack of respect for their policy on the Kurds/Ypg, whom Turkey had designated as a terrorist organization. Lebanon was keen on not seeking a war with Israel, but their smuggling operations linked to Iranian arms was of obvious concern. Nations were always trying to improve their strategic positioning, even if they had no desire to make war.

Iran maintains a death to Israel and US policy, which is not exactly an outlook of peace, and which makes it all the more perplexing as to why the democrats were very sensitive towards Iran. One lesson that can be learned, however, is "nations should never declare to export their revolution." The Communist Revolution–declared, worldwide by Lenin—led to the Cold War and fall of USSR. The Iranian Revolution—declared worldwide by Khomeini—led to tensions with Israel and US and economic constraints. The war on terror—declared worldwide by the US—led to the US invading Iraq without sufficient cause, and led to a loss of trust and loss of moral standing/reputation. The ISIS caliphate—

declared worldwide by ISIS—led to rampant terror attacks against civilians throughout the Middle East, Africa, and the rest of the world.

ISIS had expanded its influence into sub-Saharan Africa, and the terror situation there had become far worse than in the Middle East. The extended network of ISIS—Al Shabab(east Africa) and Boko Haram(west Africa) were operating at much more sadistic level. And the indiscriminate US drone program over there didn't exactly deter membership to such groups. In fact, many would argue that gave rise to them. The west Africa network of ISIS was so extreme that ISIS wanted to distance themselves from them. They even went after the leader of Boko Haram, who would blow himself up when cornered by ISIS rivals. The Middle East was a refuge when compared to many areas of West Africa. Just think about that for a moment. ISIS, the violent terror organization, had been taken aback by another group's terrorism. The Boko Haram leader forced women and children to be suicide bombers, and he also kidnapped hundreds of school girls and likely put them on the sex trafficking market.

Chapter 12: Western media support of Hamas

In May of 2021, the Israeli Defense Forces (IDF) had begun targeting Hamas weapons storage sites in Gaza, which were located in civilian buildings. Both Palestinians and Israelis had been killed during this escalation. Over 4000 rockets would be fired from Gaza into Israel. In the aftermath of the 2021 Gaza War, Hamas had been placed by western media on a moral equivalency with Israel, or may even have even been given the moral high ground. As a consequence, Israel could end up cutting ties with the US. Saudi Arabia may do the same in order to avoid similar hazards of being in alliance with the US, who has already shown some sympathy for Iran. The result of Saudi Arabia ditching the US as an ally would have disastrous consequences for the US economy.

When it came to the Gaza war, neither side of the conflict gave any concern about civilians. Hamas, however, was clearly applying a calculated strategy of provocation, launching a few rockets at Israeli civilians here and there—provoking Israeli retaliation—hoping for Palestinian casualties in the process and then simply using that as justification to launch even more rockets at Israeli civilians. The international community ignores this aspect and puts all the pressure on Israel to advance their precision capabilities in order to defend their civilian population and also neutralize the threat of deadly rocket attacks from militants in Gaza—all without endangering the Palestinian civilian population in Gaza. On the other hand, militants in Gaza were under no pressure to de-escalate, stop firing rockets at Israeli civilians, and start distributing aid to Palestinians, hence why this conflict keeps going. Keep in mind that Hamas wants to remove the entire Jewish population from Israel altogether and anyone who does not agree with that is designated as their enemy.

Hamas had inadvertently gained considerable propaganda points and had risen to a moral equivalency with Israel, at least according to the way international outrage singles out Israel as the aggressor. It would be surprising if Hamas agreed to any long term ceasefire with this much momentum on their side. The state of Israel was in serious jeopardy now. With the west demanding removal of US support from Israel, Hamas and Iran had a golden

opportunity to shift the tide of this ongoing war. The residual effect of this would also translate to a shift in the way the world perceived ISIS, which may allow them to gain new life. This could be one of the most dangerous rabbit holes that the democrats decided to go down. One may also see separatist groups in the US, as a result of Critical Race Theory, began to claim land in the name of fighting an occupation. Palestinian support for Hamas would also surge. The United States/western media may have became the propaganda arm for Hamas.

US foreign policy had been so disastrous that there was no way they would be able to maintain an alliance with Saudi Arabia. Reason being was that the far left in the west would no longer support US intervention in the Middle East. Saudi Arabia was still in a proxy war with Iran over Yemen and a big part of supporting Saudi Arabia requires supporting Sunni hegemony in the Middle East. If the US would not offer enough support toward Saudi Arabia's security, the Saudis would began to look elsewhere for alliance. A major part of US economic sustenance was the deal with Saudi Arabia—Saudi Arabia sells oil for US dollars. In exchange, US provides military support to them when necessary. Failure to own up to their end would result in Saudi Arabia looking else where and selling their oil for something else other than USD. Saudi Arabia was so powerful, it was scary. Fracking had failed in the US and the UK. And this ultimately brings power back to the Middle East when it comes to oil.

In hindsight, the left's insistence that the US reduce support for Israel and Saudi Arabia was clearly contrarianism and not rooted in any anti-war perspective because shortly after Biden took office, many of these same proponents of reducing aid to Israel and Saudi Arabia would find themselves lobbying for US military interventionism in eastern Europe, and consequently calling for military aid to Ukraine, which led to the same problem that came about from US aid to Saudi Arabia and Israel—that being civilian casualties being carried out by a US ally. Many of the weapons that the US sent to Ukraine were used in strikes that caused civilian casualties. This created a massive cognitive dissonance in many traditionally anti-war proponents. They criticized the US for sending aid to its longstanding allies because of the collateral

damage it caused, but now they (the anti-war leftists) were advocating for deployment of US weapons to an ally, which also caused civilian casualties. The cognitive dissonance had become too much to bear, so the only way for the now so-called anti-war leftists to deal the issue was to vehemently deny that Ukraine had caused any civilian casualties. Ultimately going down the pro-war rabbit hole gave the Neo-cons what they wanted and many of the anti-war leftists that supported Ukraine were shocked to find out that many republicans were in solidarity with their new pro-war, anti-Russian approach, which only allowed the Neo-cons to continue their militarism and funding of the military industrial complex for other adventures. This carried over to provocations with China over Taiwan and also silenced the now pro-war media on Iraq, which was another plus for the Neo-cons.

Chapter 13: The Afghanistan Disaster

The Biden Administration pulled the US military out of Afghanistan on August 30, 2021, ending a 20 year military operation there. After successfully overthrowing the Taliban in 2001, the remaining US military presence in the region could be defined by a long arduous process of trying to stabilize Afghanistan's new pro-democracy government. Throughout that time, the Taliban, though removed from power, remained a consistent threat to the newly installed government and was able to regain some lost territories. In February of 2020, the Trump administration and the Taliban confirmed an accordance known as the Doha Agreement, which established that the US would remove all of its troops from the Afghanistan region if the Taliban agrees to restrict Al Qaeda from operating in Taliban-held areas, as well as pursue ceasefire agreements with the new Afghan government. This correspondence between the Trump administration and the Taliban did not involve the Afghan government. Under the Doha agreement, the US would reduce US troop presence in Afghanistan from 13000 to 8600 by July 2020 and remove the remaining by May 1 2021. When Biden entered office, the number of US troops in Afghanistan had been reduced to 2500, but a month before the deadline established in the Doha agreement, Biden decided to extend the target date for withdrawal to September of 2021. On May 1st, however, which was the deadline for US troop withdrawal initially agreed upon by both Trump and the Taliban, the Taliban launched an offensive and in July, NATO would forecast that the Taliban would reclaim Afghanistan within weeks after full US withdrawal. However, the Taliban advance transpired much faster than anticipated. Consequently, the US attempted to facilitate the evacuation of embassy workers, US citizens, and Visa applicants as quickly as possible by deploying close to 5000 US troops to Kabul airport. 2000 more would be deployed following the Taliban's recapture of Kabul on August 15th. General Sami Sadat of the Afghan army considered US withdrawal as a betrayal of the Afghan army and stated to the New York Times that the agreement orchestrated by President Trump, as well as Biden's statement "American troops cannot and should not be fighting in a war and dying in a war that Afghan forces are not

willing to fight for themselves." only emboldened the Taliban. He also mentioned that the 17000 personnel contractors that left Afghanistan in July, took with them critical weapons like helicopter missile defense and tracking technologies. Ashraf Ghani, president of Afghanistan prior to the Taliban takeover, would assert that the US's abrupt withdrawal gave momentum to the Taliban. Shortly after the Taliban takeover, a suicide bombing occurred at Hamid Karzai International Airport on August 26, 2021, killing 13 US military personnel and 70 Afghan citizens. The last plane to leave Kabul airport departed on August 30, 2021.

India would more than likely take in most of those refugees as they had in the past. US operations in Afghanistan was for the sole reason of capturing or killing Osama Bin Laden. Taliban was just an obstacle. Getting around that obstacle meant by default aiding the Northern Alliance. US did what they wanted to do and began withdrawing troops. They had no real concern about ongoing the geopolitical issues there or the residual effects of their invasion. They just wanted Osama Bin Laden. As a result of US withdrawal, ISIS-k terror attacks would become a threat to Americans stranded in Afghanistan. This was horrible. So many people there had their faith in American/Afghan security apparatus. But unfortunately it collapsed pretty much overnight right before their eyes and now they were facing a perilous situation. ISIS was going to resurge and Americans there could face severe reprisals for their association with the American military. The international media could help by paying very close attention to what transpires as the attention may deter the Taliban from giving off a barbaric impression. The Taliban had more to gain by focusing on rebuilding their infrastructure and gaining allies in the process as opposed to carrying out widespread violent retribution. The US, as a result of their abrupt withdrawal from Afghanistan, needed to be very concerned about their relations with Saudi Arabia and Israel. US policy in the Middle East in the last few years was not going to go unnoticed by their allies. Saudi Arabia's security had been compromised a few times by Shiite militants in Yemen and at some point, the Saudis were going to expect more help from the US regarding Yemen. Israel had to be concerned about US propaganda painting Israel as the sole aggressor of the Palestinian conflict. While Israel does carry out

deadly attacks that injure and kill civilians, the western media had done a poor job at pointing out Hamas's role in perpetuating the conflict with rocket attacks aimed directly for civilians and without reservation.

The White House began to warn of terrorist attacks from ISIS-K on US soil. It was chilling to hear Biden say without reservation that some of those on the terror watchlist slipped right into the US from the southern border. But this should have been expected because of the open borders paradigm that the democrats fostered while Trump was in office. It wasn't long ago that 2 Houthi militants were captured after crossing into the US from Mexico. It just goes to show how vulnerable the US had become. ISIS inspired attacks had been an issue in the US for some time. However, if the US extends its hand to the Taliban, an attack directly linked to ISIS-k could manifest on US soil. It wouldn't be as sophisticated as the 9/11 attack, but it could be just as devastating i.e. a bombing or mass casualty event. ISIS was not the only terror threat to the US. All violent separatist groups were inspired by the Taliban and right now there is a situation in the US where people are divided by race, but not by land. One must keep in mind if one was going to divide the people, then one also had to divide the land. Only the former was being achieved at the moment due to the propagation of critical race theories, which fostered ethnic tensions. But in all inevitability, it will be the separatist groups who are going to ensure the latter. The democrats laid the foundation for this by villainazing the "All Lives Matter" platform and setting a steep goal of attempting to manage a country divided by ethnicity. Reading history, one can easily observe that it only takes a small number of extremist elements within any demographic to drastically alter the landscape. Majority sentiment was futile against this force. There are only two choices for Americans. Either call the country back together(probably not possible at this point) or face serious national security ramifications. Extremist ethnocentric radicals don't believe in the cohesion of different races, and the Democratic Party's insistence on keeping the country divided on racial issues has inadvertently aligned them with the goals of radical separatists. CRT gives them all a convincing platform to recruit.

ISIS-K claimed responsibility for Kunduz mosque blast killing at

least 55. ISIS-K was strikingly similar to Wahhabism in that their violence was based on extreme fundamentalism, where any deviation(even the most minute) from the most strict application of Sharia law was considered haram and punishable by death. This was exactly ISIS-k's grievance with the Taliban. Notwithstanding, there were still other factions like the Massoud loyalists who were vying for control over Afghanistan. So, the region was still quite far from attaining any measure of stability in the near future. ISIS-k was attempting to take control by inciting sectarian violence; bombing the Shias and inciting them to attack Sunnis. This would further destabilize Taliban control. However, the presence of other factions(like the Massoud loyalists) interested in gaining control of Afghanistan complicates the matter. This was similar to what went on in Syria with ISIS and the Anti-Assad rebels. The same dynamic occurred in Iraq with Al Qaeda and the Mahdi Army.

ISIS-k was also plotting to blow up Northern Virginia shopping malls. Shopping malls and places where people gather in large quantities were a prime threat. However, ISIS was not the only threat. America still had to contend with separatist groups who were seeking identity and land. One cannot sustain a divided country without dividing the land. And these identity groups had a similar mindset as ISIS, which was basically an outlook that sees terror as nothing more than a tool in which the end would justify the means. In fact, they only see terror as a critical component needed for building a nation since most established nations had origins in small groups of people who went out and orchestrated terrorist acts. Hopefully America, especially the democrats, learns a lesson: You don't help cultivate division and chaos just to make a sitting president look bad. Why? Because division eventually turns into sectarianism, which leads to separatism, which leads to territorial disputes, and then finally violent conflict. It doesn't happen overnight, but once it gets moving, it only gains momentum. Foreign terrorist organization like ISIS-k or any entities hostile to the US for that matter would be more than willing to aid and abet the operations of sectarian groups originating in the United States, emboldening them to plot against the state. In fact, many were already in the US, slipping undetected through the Mexican/US border. America was already a humiliated country and they were

not helping the Taliban. So, in that sense, they may not be as critical of a target for ISIS-k. Foreign-based terror attacks were usually rooted in occupation issues. 9/11 was based largely on that; Egypt and many other Arab countries were against US intervention in Kuwait back in the early 90s. Yet the US insisted their troops be stationed in Saudi Arabia, which is considered Holy Land by the Arabs. This among other factors was used by Al-Qaeda to justify 9/11.

Chapter 14: The Coronavirus debacle

In late 2019, China confirmed that the coronavirus could pass human to human. Official Infection count nears 450 as the outbreak began to spread. Because the only option was to rely on one's immune system to fight the virus, the challenge posed to China by the outbreak would be on maintaining social order and keeping any panic from devolving into social unrest. This outbreak came in the wake of mass demonstrations against the Chinese government by Hong Kong citizens. And at this point. someone as young as 36 was now part of the death toll from coronavirus and the illness had already spread to other countries. An official declaration that this a global emergency would be made by the World Health Organization so that enough resources could go into the research that could help find a way to stop virus's permeation.

Civil unrest was always a concern, which was why there was usually apprehension about raising alarms, however withholding information about the scope and scale of the situation only slowed down the process of getting the spread of the illness under control. Once more cases were confirmed in Europe and other places, the W.H.O would finally declare the coronavirus issue to be a global emergency. Coronavirus had become more widespread than SARS was in 2002-2003. Initially research was stifled by intellectual property quarrels, which threatened to make the crisis worse and end up provoking western researchers into withholding information about cures that could save lives. Chinese researchers applying for patents on American drugs allowed the Chinese government to spend less money and thus provide more people in China with adequate treatment. This was a good thing, but it still nonetheless could have triggered some negative sentiments since much of the tariff conflict between the US and China stems from issues regarding how intellectual property should be defined.

Before COVID-19, the open borders paradigm set by the left was so strong that if Trump did apply the necessary decisiveness to close the borders in response, it would have been met with such strong hostility that the dynamics of how COVID-19 was interpreted by each side of the political spectrum in 2020 would have ended up being the total opposite—where the left would be downplaying the

seriousness of it and the right conveying the sense of urgency regarding it. The contrarianism had become very much embedded in US politics.

The pathogenesis of COVID-19(coronavirus) leads to what is called acute respiratory distress syndrome(ARDS) and has impacted the entire world. The outbreak originated in Wuhan, China in December of 2019 and began to spread globally around mid-January of 2020. In March of that year, the World Health Organization officially recognized the coronavirus outbreak as a pandemic disease. The most common symptoms of COVID-19 infection are fever, fatigue, cough, and shortness of breath, with the most significant effects being inflammation and oxidative stress which lead to Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS) and organ damage. The most common symptom which leads to hospital admission is shortness of breath. Starting in late 2020 a number of vaccines have been rolled out to be administered to the general population. The Moderna vaccine developed in Cambridge Massachusetts has been confirmed in clinical trials to have a 94% efficacy. The AstraZeneca ChAdOx1 vaccine, developed by the University of Oxford in the UK, has an efficacy of 90%. The vaccine was also tested in Brazil, the US, India and South Africa. In 2020, German and US companies BioNtech and Pfizer began testing the BNT162 vaccine, which was found to have a 95% efficacy—a 94% efficacy in 65 and older. US company Johnson and Johnson developed a vaccine that has an 85% efficacy. Early indications showed that the vaccines reduced the chance of infection and spread of the COVID-19 Alpha variant. The efficacy of the vaccines, however, began to drop as the new Delta variant of COVID-19 began to spread worldwide. It originated in India in February of 2021 and was confirmed to be much more infectious and transmissible than the original Alpha variant. The efficacy of the vaccines are reduced against the Delta variant, according to vaccine researchers. The percent reduction varies. A US study found that the PfizerBioNtech vaccine efficacy against Delta is 88%, while an Israeli study finds that the same vaccine is only 64%. effective. This book is intended examine the adverse effects of the vaccine and how it relates to cytomegalovirus reactivation and also make a case for the isolated use of Vitamin E as a measure that could hypothetically alleviate

symptomatic fatigue and shortness of breath in COVID-19 infections and thus possibly reduce hospital and ICU admission.

In June and July of 2021, a small number of breakthrough cases have been reported globally. Both partially and fully vaccinated have been testing positive for COVID-19 with mild symptoms. A few have been admitted to the hospital with more severe symptoms and some have been admitted to ICU. This has corresponded with a larger surge of COVID-19 infections in unvaccinated, many of whom are hesitant to receive the Covid19 vaccine due to reports of adverse effects. Hospitals have reported that a greater percentage of those hospitalized and admitted to ICU with severe Covid infection are unvaccinated. It has also been reported that a greater number of unvaccinated young people are being hospitalized with severe cases as a result of the Delta variant.

Thousands of fatal adverse effects related to the vaccine ranging from deadly blood clots to heart inflammation and sudden cardiac death were reported to the VAERS Vaccine Adverse Effects Reporting System. Historically, it has been estimated that reports on the VAERS reporting system is roughly one percent of actual cases. In the past, pharmaceuticals and other vaccines have been suspended from just dozens of reports of adverse effects. The Swine Flu vaccine in 1976 was discontinued when 15 deaths were reported as being a result of the vaccine.

Another factor that led to vaccine hesitancy was based on how the CDC began to change its guidance on what the vaccines were able to achieve as far as fighting COVID-19. At first, it was stated that if a person was vaccinated against COVID-19, they no longer needed to quarantine and wear a mask. Presumably this meant that the vaccines limited the spread of the virus. However, confusion set in when the CDC later changed their advisory and warned that the vaccines did not prevent the spread of the virus, but only prevented serious illness and death. In October of 2022, Pfizer spokesperson admitted during a European Parliament hearing that the COVID-19 vaccine was never tested on its ability to stop the spread of the virus. Some researchers have discovered that the vaccine increases the risk of infection, but lowers the chances of severe illness and death, which theoretically allow the virus to live longer and mutate. The science behind the mRNA vaccine is enough to make this

conclusion.

The obfuscation of information regarding the vaccine and its capabilities has fostered mistrust, as well as a large number of conspiracy theories, many of which involve ideas that COVID-19 was a hoax and that the vaccine was meant to kill off and reduce the population. Of course, there is the other extreme that believes that the vaccine does not cause adverse events and that the million adverse events reported on the VAERS is simply exaggerated and fictitious information put there by hostile actors. Right now, the medical community is trying to navigate this revolting dynamic of extremes who are using the COVID-19 situation to justify their personal political outlook. It's maintained that anyone questioning the safety of the vaccine is a far right conspiracy theorist. While those advocating the vaccine are far left pundits bent on reducing the population. What should have been done from the start of the vaccine roll-out was to objectively examine information regarding why adverse effects were happening to a small portion of population, as opposed to dismissing or obfuscating that data for fear of giving rise to vaccine hesitancy. Hiding the data only prevents a win-win situation from coming about that would lead to a greater safety outcome.

Illnesses can be cured by preventing it with a vaccine or treating it with medication. Both were rarely 100% effective. Flu was caused by either influenza viruses or coronaviruses. Influenza viruses and Coronaviruses had been known(even before 2019) to cause flu in the US and around the world. There had never been any substantial preventative or treatment protocol to effectively eradicate the causes of the flu. Flu vaccines were only 67% effective(that was not eradication). Small pox and polio vaccines were 95%-100% effective(that was closer to eradication). If influenza virus vaccines had not come close to that 100% success rate ever, how can another vaccine for a virus that causes the same flu effect all of a sudden exceed that.

In mid-2021, 49.2% in the US had been fully vaccinated. 56% had only been partially vaccinated. It seemed in many states, the partially vaccinated were being classified with the unvaccinated as far as percentage of Covid-related fatalities. A number of sources from different local counties had stated that 99% of COVID fatalities

were among unvaccinated and partially vaccinated. There was a lot of confusion regarding the data and many Americans were becoming suspicious of handling of the pandemic.

Reports of breakthrough deaths were on the rise after the CDC said that fully vaccinated people no longer needed to wear a face mask or stay 6 feet away from others in most settings, whether outdoors or indoors. Even though some of the data showed that even during the massive delta surge, vaccination would cut the risk of death from COVID-19, the percentage of breakthrough deaths were still elevated in Massachusetts, but remained low in Oregon, Illinois, New Hampshire, Nebraska, and Minnesota. Texas and Louisiana were reluctant to update the number of breakthrough death cases, and Florida was not reporting breakthrough deaths at all. Louisiana finally reported 100 breakthrough deaths of fully vaccinated individuals. Only 9% of those who died of COVID-19 between July 7, 2021 and August 16, 2021 were fully vaccinated.

It seemed like lot was riding on innate immune response. The vaccines induce a temporary immune suppression of the Type 1 interferon response in exchange for higher viral exposure, antigen presentation, and the subsequent b-cell antibody production. This increases the chances of infection, but lowers the chances of severe sickness and death. It also allows the virus to live longer and mutate into other variants, which then require another vaccine. And the antibody response from mrna vaccination was largely variant specific. Whereas the innate immune type-1 interferon response was variant non-specific and was triggered by cell-membrane disturbances, such as when the virus attaches to the host cell.

Still and all. the mRNA vaccine did what it was intended to do. It wiped out the alpha variant. But with the virus and its mutations far ahead of the variant specific vaccines, the only way for the vaccine to curtail the spread of the virus would be for vaccine makers to predict spike protein mutations in the next variant and develop a vaccine from that information. Highly improbable unless there was AI technology capable of it. Moderna admitted that the current vaccines would likely be less effective against this new variant. The mrna vaccines were variant specific, and suppresses the innate immune response in exchange for a more robust

antibody response, which would theoretically increase your risk of infection, but lower your chances of severe illness and death. The political backdrop that coincided with the vaccine rollout would make it near impossible for anyone to find a real solution, since things like cognitive dissonance, denial, stubborn pride, and this never surrender attitude would just compel people to accept that they had already figured it out, even in the face of evidence that may show otherwise. A good bulk of us humans were wired this way, unfortunately. And the belief of having it figured out was not the central issue. The central issue was the character assassination of anyone who may have a different approach in a time when the initial approach had not lived up to its billing (initially, people were told they would not have to wear their mask or social distance after they got the vaccine). However, at this point, people were slowing coming to the perspective that people may be justified in choosing their approach, either vaccine or some other methodology due to waning effectiveness of the vaccine amidst other variants.

Later it became clear that the media and the state were suppressing facts in real time, even admitting they were mistaken after the fact. Studies were now confirming the vaccines do cause adverse affects like myocarditis among younger people, longer menstrual cycles among women which makes it more difficult for them to had children. Now Pfizer was admitting they had no idea if the vaccine could stop transmission. This meant that it was likely that the vaccine actually increased the spread of the virus since it suppresses the body's type-1 interferon response. One of the worse instances of misinformation relayed by the media was that hydroxychloroquine was completely ineffective for COVID when standard protocol for many hospitals around world treating severe cases of Covid was in fact hydroxychloroquine. This was Trump Derangement Syndrome at its worst, denying the effectiveness of something solely based on whether or not Trump advocated for it. This was so ridiculous.

Reports began circulating on social media that mandates for Covid-vaccines that would later be applied to US policy was a direct violation of the Nuremberg Code. Here are the ten points of the Nuremberg code which outline the parameters by which experimental research can be conducted on human subjects.

1. The voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential. This means that the person involved should have legal capacity to give consent; should be situated as to be able to exercise free power of choice, without the intervention of any element of force, fraud, deceit, duress, over-reaching, or other ulterior form of constraint or coercion, and should have sufficient knowledge and comprehension of the elements of the subject matter involved as to enable him to make an understanding and enlightened decision. This latter element requires that before the acceptance of an affirmative decision by the experimental subject there should be made known to him the nature, duration, and purpose of the experiment; the method and means by which it is to be conducted; all inconveniences and hazards reasonably to be expected; and the effects upon his health or person which may possibly come from his participation in the experiment.

The duty and responsibility for ascertaining the quality of the consent rests upon each individual who initiates, directs or engages in the experiment. It is a personal duty and responsibility which may not be delegated to another with impunity.

2. The experiment should be such as to yield fruitful results for the good of society, unprocurable by other methods or means of study, and not random and unnecessary in nature.

3. The experiment should be so designed and based on the results of animal experimentation and a knowledge of the natural history of the disease or other problem under study that the anticipated results will justify the performance of the experiment.

4. The experiment should be so conducted as to avoid all unnecessary physical and mental suffering and injury.

5. No experiment should be conducted where there is an a priori reason to believe that death or disabling injury will occur; except, perhaps, in those experiments where the experimental physicians also serve as subjects.

6. The degree of risk to be taken should never exceed that determined by the humanitarian importance of the problem to be solved by the experiment.

7. Proper preparations should be made and adequate facilities provided to protect the experimental subject against even remote possibilities of injury disability or death.

8. The experiment should be conducted only by scientifically qualified persons. The highest degree of skill and care should be required through all stages of the experiment of those who conduct or engage in the experiment.

9. During the course of the experiment the human subject should be at liberty to bring the experiment to an end if he has reached the physical or mental state where continuation of the experiment seems to him to be impossible.

10. During the course of the experiment the scientist in charge must be prepared to terminate the experiment at any stage, if he has probable cause to believe, in the exercise of the good faith, superior skill and careful judgement required by him that a continuation of the experiment is likely to result in injury, disability, or death to the experimental subject.

The Food and Drug Administration's emergency use authorization of the COVID-19 vaccines for public use and whether or not the mandates that followed constitute a violation of the Nuremberg code boils down to establishing what defines "experimental." According to section 564 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FD&C Act), the Secretary of Health of Human Services (HHS) can declare that an emergency use authorization (EUA) for an unapproved product is appropriate, to which then would allow the FDA to authorize the unapproved medical products or vaccines for use in a public health emergency for the purpose of diagnosing, treating, or preventing serious or life-threatening diseases or conditions caused by various pathogens. However, according to the

law, this is only permissible if there are no viable and adequate alternatives. In the case of the COVID-19 pandemic, many would argue that Hydroxychloroquine and Ivermectin were a viable options at that time, and were enough to manage the pandemic. Trump had advocated for the use of Hydroxychloroquine as a measure to fight against Covid-19. The media, however, covered up information that qualified Hydroxychloroquine's effectiveness against COVID-19.

The crux of the issue regarding adherence to or violation of the Nuremberg Code is not about the FDA's emergency use authorization (EUA) for unapproved vaccines. The main issue regards whether or not the vaccines were experimental at the time of the EUA and whether or not the COVID-19 vaccine mandates subsequently applied by the US government involved an "experimental vaccine." It must be said that a recommendation by the Dept of Health and Human Services that emergency use authorization for a medical product or vaccine is warranted does not constitute regulatory approval when it comes to the safety and efficacy of the product. This is why it is easy to presume that both the HHS's recommendation for an EUA, as well as the FDA's subsequent emergency use authorization of the COVID-19 vaccines must have meant that the vaccines were indeed approved for safety. This is not the case. It is written in the FD&C Act that a regulatory body like the FDA can approve unapproved vaccines for public use. The FDA approved the unapproved COVID-19 vaccines for emergency use authorization in December of 2020. They would not approve the Pfizer vaccine for safety and efficacy until August of 2021. Unsurprisingly, the very next month in September of 2021, the US President signed executive orders to mandate COVID-19 vaccination for a large portion of the US workforce.

So this leaves us to conclude that because the vaccines were never approved by a regulatory body for safety and efficacy until August of 2021, the Pfizer vaccine would have indeed fell under the classification of "experimental" between December of 2020 and August of 2021, during a time when vaccination was voluntary. Hence, this initial roll-out of the "experimental" vaccines, when Trump was still president, would not have violated the Nuremberg code because of the voluntary aspect involved in anyone's decision

to get vaccinated. Thereafter in September of 2021, however, when Biden was President, such a tag of "experimental" would not have applied to the Pfizer vaccine's 2-dose protocol because it was indeed approved for safety and efficacy by a regulatory body, which is why the US government waited until September of 2021—after the FDA approved the Pfizer vaccine for safety—to began initiating vaccine mandates for US workers. The coercive element of vaccine mandates would not have been in violation of the Nuremberg code, at least in the case of the Pfizer vaccine, because, technically, the product in question would have been approved for safety by a regulatory body and could thus not be classified as "experimental." The Moderna vaccine did not receive FDA approval for safety and efficacy until January of 2022.

Still and all, the FDA's approval for safety and efficacy of the Moderna and Pfizer vaccine only applied to the primary series by which 2 doses of either the Pfizer or Moderna vaccine constituted being fully vaccinated. The booster shots, however, is another story. The booster shots, to be administered every six months, would be shortly thereafter approved by the FDA in late 2021, but only under the emergency use authorization, and not for safety and efficacy. The bivalent vaccine booster shots for Pfizer and Moderna were approved for EUA in 2022, even before clinical trials were set to begin. This would have made the booster shots "experimental" and any mandates for boosters thereafter a form of coercion in violation of Nuremberg. The booster shots were not approved by a regulatory body for safety and efficacy, and in this regard, the coercive aspects of vaccine mandates being applied to booster shots would have been a violation of the Nuremberg code that prohibits the use of coercion for an experimental treatment. See point 1 of the Nuremberg Code. The booster mandates between 2021 and 2023 could thus be considered a violation of the Nuremberg code.

Chapter 15: Democrat pro-war Rabbit hole and the war in Ukraine

In late 2021, Russia had been gradually building up its forces at the Ukrainian border since the conflict in the Donbas region began in 2014. The main issue surrounding the conflict was getting water into Crimea. After Russia annexed Crimea, Ukraine cut the water supply going into Crimea from the North Crimean Canal. In response Russia's entire policy against Ukraine had become centered around finding other ways to get flowing water into Crimea. Once such strategy was getting the pro-Russian separatists to spread unrest in eastern Ukraine, followed by persuading officials there to hold a secession referendum. The pro-Russian separatists attempted to do this in Donetsk and Luhansk. But when officials would refuse to hold a referendum, the pro-Russian separatists resorted to violence and force and did manage to establish somewhat of a republic. Thankfully things had calmed down since 2014-2015 quite a bit in terms of shelling and violence. The main goal of Russia was the establishment of a puppet state in eastern Ukraine, so that supplies like water and gas can flow into Crimea. Meanwhile. there was some concern about oligarch influence. Many of the volunteer militias aiding Ukraine government forces against the separatists were privately funded by wealthy oligarchs. There was fear that any territory seized by these privately funded militias would be used as political leverage by oligarchs looking for favors, i.e tax concessions, subsidies, etc

It was unfortunate that NATO had decided to take an approach that would only escalate the situation. NATO shunned Ukraine back in 2003 after it was found out that Ukraine had sold radar systems to Iraq just prior to the Iraq War. But in 2008, The Bush administration announced the intention to admit Ukraine into NATO, a move that helped further cultivate tensions between Russia and the West. In retrospect, after the Warsaw pact dissolved, NATO had never made any security guarantees to Russia. Combine that with their appalling mid-east policy over the last 2 decades, now NATO had only made Russia feel more threatened. And because of this fear, Russia had been pursuing increasingly aggressive policies against its neighbors, most recently against Ukraine. Because US

defense aid arrived in Ukraine, Russia would more than likely began arming guerrillas in Latin America, many of which include mid-east Shiite militants. A few times in the past, Russia had nearly completed transactions with cartel members, transactions which involved anti-aircraft weaponry. Russia would likely make the same offer the Germans made to Mexico back during World War I; an offer that involved Texas being returned to Mexico. So sad to see it come to this. Americans had no clue of the residual implications of this, or just how extensive Russia's Shiite/Cartel network had become over the years.

Putin for all intents and purposes was soft when he first became president of Russia, very soft. He nearly had Russia join NATO. At the time pre-9/11, there was no need for him to present himself as this strong leader, especially with regards to the west. But when our US military/NATO began carrying out reckless activities in the Middle East with little to no repercussions, other nations went on high alert. So of course, it was to be expected that Russia would be leery of its neighbors making military and economic alliances with an entity that can pretty much do whatever it wants with little to no consequences. It was hopeful for many prior to the Russian invasion of Ukraine that Ukraine was adamant that a Russian invasion was not imminent. Still and all, the Biden Administration continued to behave recklessly with Russia and many Americans were willing to abandon critical thinking and go along with it. Ukraine's defense minister had already said that Ukraine would just prefer to have the US/NATO supply arms over sending troops there. Back in 2017, the US approved sending heavy weapons to Ukraine, a move that escalated the conflict. In 2018, the Trump Administration offered to deploy troops to Ukraine to help deter Russia. This is not surprising because it is typical of Neo-con foreign policy. Even as of 2023, many republicans like Mike Pence are flirting with the idea of sending US troops to fight on the ground in Ukraine. But Ukraine, throughout the conflict, was very confident that with enough weaponry, they can stave off a Russian advance. Bringing troops on foreign soil was always a complex issue, and in many ways could lead to residual problems. This was a big issue during the Gulf War. Even though Saudi Arabia insisted that US troops intervene in Kuwait, other Arab nations like Egypt initially

opposed the presence of US military. Even within Saudi Arabia, groups like the Wahhabis rose up against US presence in Saudi Arabia. Same happened in Syria. Some pro-Syrian groups rose up and revolted against the presence of Russian troops on their soil, even though Russian troops were there to aid them against ISIS and the Syrian rebels. Even in light of the prospect that the republicans could move to send US troops to Ukraine for the purpose of a direct conflict with Russia, the democrats in going so far down the pro-war rabbit hole would not be able to provide any push-back on the matter.

Russia still had to be careful because in the past whenever they embarked upon any conflict that didn't go over well with their population, the people there revolted and overthrew the government. This had been largely due to the fact that Russia had never achieved the economic viability of its western counterparts. Hence, why anti-war protests and overthrow in Russia had historically coincided with complaints of the Russian government's economic neglect. This was what happened during the Russia-Japan conflict and it led to an uprising in Russia in 1905. Later, Russian involvement in World War I was followed by the overthrow of both the tsarist regime and the subsequent provisional government. Even then, economic issues were a huge catalyst. Russia making no qualms about appearing as an aggressor and launching a full-scale invasion of Ukraine would likely give way to antiwar pro-Ukrainian sympathizers in Russia and could set off a chain of events that could challenge the very sustainment of the Russian Federation. If sanctions were applied concurrently, then economic fallback in Russia could show history repeat itself—the people of Russia becoming highly ill-content with their government. When it comes to the sympathizer element, this dynamic had even happened in Ukraine at the start of the Donbas conflict. The Azov Battalion, a pro-Ukrainian militia group that defended Mariupol from being taken by the pro-Russian separatists, was actually comprised of majority Russian-speakers from eastern Ukraine, who likely sympathized with the Ukrainian-speakers and thus joined their ranks. This dynamic could also apply within the Russian Federation if Russia cannot convince their own country that they were justified to launch a full-scale invasion of Ukraine. As a side note, World War

II didn't lead to the collapse of the Soviet Union because Germany was clearly the aggressor, but later economic issues in 80s did lead to the fall of the Soviet Union. So Russia, if it plans to embark on any major military incursion, had to be prepared for the economic fallback and the public reaction to it, which could have systemic implications for the current Russian administration.

At the moment, I don't believe Russia ever intended to launch a full-scale invasion of Ukraine if Ukraine had refused to join NATO. It was important to keep in mind that much of what was happening was on the heels of a civil war within Ukraine between pro-Russian Ukrainians and pro-Ukrainian Ukrainians in eastern Ukraine. Remember, the Russian annexation of Crimea came after the majority Russian-speaking population there issued a referendum and voted for Crimea to leave Ukraine and join the Russian federation. Referendums were legally neutral from an international standpoint, but Ukraine and the UN didn't recognize the referendum as legitimate, so what Ukraine did was launch a sort of mini scorched-earth policy, damming the North Crimean canal and restricting the flow of water into Crimea, the now Russian territory. Russia thus helped cultivate pro-Russian separatism in eastern Ukraine so that a puppet state could be set up, allowing supplies like gas and water to flow into Crimea. The pro-Russian separatists managed to carve out autonomous territory in Luhansk and Donetsk and much of Russia's strategy was to maintain the autonomy of those regions until Ukraine was prepared to listen to Russia's view of the situation. The conflict had come quite a long way from where it was back in 2014-2015, and it was such a shame to watch the democrats of all people, to undo all of the progress that came about from the Minsk protocols and other de-escalation efforts that transpired over the years. Too bad the US doesn't apply DIME in their foreign policy anymore. Russia and the US certainly had a common enemy in ISIS, but it seems the US was adamant about keeping itself out of the fray of the Russia-Iran-Syria-Shiite consortium.

Initially, the Russian buildup was to prevent Ukraine from reclaiming separatist territory, and nothing more. If Ukraine went all in on Donetsk and Luhansk, then Russia would likely move in to prevent that from happening. It was not on Russia to make the first

move. It was on Ukraine, because at the moment the DPR and LPR were still autonomous. The Biden administration began undermining Ukraine on the Russia issue, and they started refusing to share intel with Ukraine. This was ripe for disaster and setting the stage for a power struggle between Ukraine and the US. Ukraine was not going to sit back and let the US call the shots on their soil. Ukraine was not a third world country, but the US was treating them like they were. Prior to the Russian invasion, Zelensky demanded proof of Moscow's attack plans, and decried intelligence reports as 'only provoking panic and not helping us'. This was disgusting to watch. The US creating panic in Ukraine, a country that was trying to heal from a violent civil war. Now the president of Ukraine was stating clearly that the US had not shared intel with them on an imminent Russian invasion, and had also stated that US rhetoric was actually hurting them. This was crazy and sad.

Ukraine was a country of both Russian speakers and Ukrainian speakers, and it was the separatist Russian-speaking Ukrainians in eastern Ukraine that solicited the aid of the Russian Federation and who also shot down the MH17 passenger jet with Russian artillery. By backing the separatists, Russia without question destabilized Ukraine and prolonged the conflict, similar to how the US backed separatists did so in Libya and Syria and essentially destroyed and destabilized those countries, before abandoning their commitments. But over the years so much progress had been made at de-escalating the conflict in Ukraine, particularly through the efforts of France and Germany—Angela Merkel was highly influential. She can speak fluent Russia, and when the Neo-cons volunteered to send troops to Ukraine a few years back, she immediately shot down that idea fearing it would basically lead to what is happening now.

For years leading up to now, NATO and the US had been conducting provocative military drills near Russia's borders, rehearsing airstrike maneuvers and ballistic missile defense. Even rejecting joint agreements from Russian Generals in which both sides would scale down military exercises. Of course Russia was going to feel they need to secure their borders. Combine that with the fact the NATO had never given Russia any security guarantees since the Warsaw pact and the Soviet Union ended. NATO/US had

provoked this entire fiasco. Another thing too was that much of the NATO/US provocation near Russia's borders happened during Trump's tenure, someone who everyone says was pro-Russian. Trump may have been pro-Putin, but he was not pro-Russian by any means, often saying if he was still president, he would send nuclear submarines to eastern Europe in order to stop the Russian invasion. However, this should not surprise anyone who has any inkling of republican politics.

The west ignored the fact that the majority Russian-speaking population in Crimea voted in a referendum to have Crimea join with the Russian Federation prior to the annexation. Hence why Ukrainian forces simply withdrew and let Russian troops move in. Referendums were not illegal from an international standpoint, so technically after the referendum, Crimea had become a part of Russia. Ukraine knows that the Russian buildup along the border was more about Russia preparing in the event that Ukraine does join NATO. Because if that happens, NATO and US forces would gather at the eastern border near Russia and conduct provocational military exercises on a regular basis. It would essentially become a permanent fixture of geopolitics in that area. Remember, the US had proven that they do not need justification to invade a country and for the past 4 or 5 years, prior to the year 2022, had been conducting dangerous military exercises along Russia's border where Finland and Sweden are located. Russia had asked NATO on numerous occasions for both themselves and the US to scale it down, but the US had refused. On the eve of the Russian invasion of February 24, 2022, democrat US propaganda had its grip on the public and Americans were completely swayed, even leftist had become total pro-war nationalists who had all of a sudden forgot the fact that the US military and NATO had wiped out more civilians in the Middle East than that of all other nations combined.

NATO had a policy where any country involved in a border dispute cannot join. However, from a strategic standpoint, the US would have had an advantage in being able to had access to the eastern border of Ukraine. It would have allowed their troops to set up defense protocols right on the Russian border and influence Russian domestic policy. Now imagine the flip side, that being Russian troops conducting military exercises at the Mexican/US

border, and how much outrage that would garner from Americans. Before the war, it was only that northwestern area of the Russian border where NATO/US could conduct drills, the area where Finland and Sweden were located. With Ukraine joining NATO, US military would be able to expand the geography in terms of where they could conduct drills. Ukraine is critical to Russia's security because n the past, any incursions into Russia had to pass through Ukraine. Going through Ukraine was the strategy that many of Russia's foes throughout history had against applied against Russia. In the 1500s, the Crimean Tatars use to raid Russian territory via eastern Ukraine. Sweden went through Ukraine during the Great Northern War in 1709 before being repelled by Russian tsar Peter the Great, and Hitler went through Ukraine in order to conduct an invasion of Russia. It was likely that the US would conduct a pretext in order to justify an invasion of Russia, and theoretically if able to gain access to Ukraine's eastern border along with the American public's blind support, the US could easily embark upon such a course of action. If Ukraine joins NATO, however, it would automatically turn the conflict into the US vs Russia, with Ukraine relegated to be a vassal state. US would simply feed Ukraine with news of Russian invasion prospects so that Ukraine would allow the US army free access to their eastern border. Ukraine would simply fade into the background and play second fiddle to the US commander in chief.

In early 2021 Russia had yet yet officially recognized the DPR and LPR as independent. Russia had thus far at that point only recognized DPR and LPR issued documents like driver's licenses as valid in Russia, but still considered the Donbas region as part of Ukraine. But with Ukraine declaring their intention to join NATO shortly thereafter, it was certainly predictable that Russia would move to recognize the the DPR and LPR as separate from Ukraine in order to justify bringing more Russian troops into the region. If this process of Russian troop advancement into the DPR and LPR region was impeded in some way, it could have compelled some type of false flag in order to justify breaching Ukraine's borders all out. The only hope to avert war was containment, which was what the Minsk protocol did, calling for a special status for the DPR and LPR and very slow re-integration back into Ukraine. However, the Biden administration and its threatening rhetoric had completely

compromised any of that from transpiring.

The US didn't need another war on foreign soil and this administration like the last one was flirting with danger, going around disrupting diplomatic containment strategies geared towards preventing a horrifying outcome should military technology be used at full scale. How do you think Zelensky got elected in the first place? Because he showed to Ukraine that he was willing to do whatever it took to de-escalate the crisis in Ukraine, appealing to both Russian speakers and Ukrainian speakers. But now look at his approval rating, it had plummeted. The coup attempt a month before the Russian invasion was orchestrated by Ukrainians who do not want Ukraine to be allied with NATO or the US, because it was just going to make matters worse in their country. The weapons at Russia and the US disposal would decimate everything. Most of this war mongering support for Ukraine was coming from westerners who didn't know anything about Ukraine and was only focused on observing where Trump stood on the matter and simply taking the opposite stance.

The Russia buildup along Ukrainian borders was about NATO addressing his security concerns, and Ukraine keeping their distance from NATO if they refuse to make concessions. In fact, NATO was a major flashpoint on this very specific issue since if Ukraine decided not to join NATO, Russia would have essentially removed their troops from the borders, and thus the situation in Ukraine would have been contained. Now with Ukraine joining NATO, Russia had every reason to fear US/NATO provocations on a regular basis at Ukraine's eastern border.

It was favorable for Ukraine to be militarily sovereign and independent, because that was what would maintain the security of all of Europe, for them not to side with Russia or join a coalition like NATO. In fact such would ease concerns in both eastern and western Europe, leading both sides having to ensure Ukraine remain independent, a huge plus considering historically they've never really achieved this. Both western Europe and Russia has had a hand in controlling Ukraine throughout the centuries. For a time Ukraine was divided between Russia and Poland. After WWI and during WWII, even as Ukraine declared themselves liberated from Russia as Germany advanced, they still came under the control of

German forces. There had always been a slight tug of war between east and west when came to control of Ukraine, and in order for Ukraine to really get to experience what it is like to be a nation, they need to stand alone. For a brief time, they were able to do this. But a schism occurred within their own country, which divided Russian speakers and Ukrainian speakers and this had allowed outside forces like Russia and NATO to exacerbate problems related to this.

This situation was about learning from World War I. World War II was just just a continuation of World War I from the German perspective. They just lost a major war and a large swath of territory, territory gained during the Franco-Prussian War. Comparing Germany's situation after their humiliating defeat in World War I to Russia's current situation was comparing apples and oranges. Germany was out for revenge. Russia fears an imperial country invading theirs by going though Ukraine. People were applying a familiarity bias here, believing that false flag attacks, aggressive military policy, backing separatists and launching invasions were only a Russian thing, that somehow the US just didn't think in this manner. This ignorance were even maintained by people who had taken anti-war stances against US foreign policy in years past. It was as if the last 20 years of US foreign policy was wiped out from people's memory. Neo-cons are going to be Neo-cons, so there is no surprise about their denialism, but to see the left and the democrats fall into this outlook of denialism was a huge plow to the traditional anti-war movement in the US. All those atrocities just faded into thin air, as if it never happened. But nevermind the invasion of Iraq, look up Operation Northwoods. America's Department of Defense had detailed plans to launch attacks on its own citizens in order to get support for an invasion of Cuba. Thankfully JFK didn't approve of it. What he have now was the ultimatum aspect that leads to wars. One country making demands upon another, while the other looking to save face refusing to comply or listen. Allies get involved promising to back the one refusing, and then a domino effect occurs and huge war breaks. At the outset everyone feels justified, but as time passes and soldiers and civilians began to die in the thousands or the millions, people back home who initially supported the war start calling for

an end to it because it begins to seem pointless. This was what was happening now, and human lack of critical thinking is why it would just keep happening generation after generation.

When Obama was in office, many who were sympathetic to Syria and Libya, all of a sudden felt a surge of patriotism when Trump got in office. Abandoning containment strategies in favor of aggressive rhetoric and threats of invasion became okay with them all of a sudden. Meanwhile, the left took the anti-American route, criticizing America at every turn, dividing the country among race, creed and everything else you name, all before apologizing to a country that states with its very own mouth “Death To America, Death To Israel.” Now that its the democrats turn in office, patriotism had become okay now and the US all of a sudden was not that bad? This is where problem was. The left had opened the door to anti-American, anti-war sentiments, and found themselves having to walk back such notions when it was their turn to wield power. It was unfortunate that the Trump narratives were being used by the left as the litmus test to validate their political views. It was a tragic mistake. At the moment the left doesn't realize that by blindly supporting the US neocons in their hostility towards Russia, it would give the US military the green light to become more aggressive not just against Russia but also against Russia’s allies, such as Syria, Iran, NK, and China, something they had been wanting to do for decades now. The Left would find themselves having to go along with it all. The left was not realizing that they were actually playing into the hands of the war mongers that they have stood up against for so many decades.

Our military industrial complex certainly had one goal and that was to use the weapons that they had worked so hard to develop. Gen Leslie Groves felt strongly that if the US was going to put so much effort and investment towards developing a nuclear bomb during the Manhattan project in the early 1940s, then they should certainly intend to use them. Eisenhower was right. People had to be vigilant and diplomacy had to become central. Humans are not fighting with spears, swords and shields anymore. This era of conflict was going to require compromise and appearing as a doormat in some cases. War was off the table and any approach that cultivates it was not an option. In Ukraine, there was always going

to be a pro-Russian element. In fact, many in eastern and southern Ukraine were pro-Russian. And the US not being cognizant of this, may have re-upset the balance within Ukraine and reignited domestic discord there.

The left conflating the desire to use diplomacy with Russia as something to be inherently pro-Russian/anti-American was extremely dangerous and takes a page right out of McCarthyism. Too many at the moment don't have a clue about the backdrop concerning NATO/US tensions with Russia. In 1994, the Clinton administration started the NATO expansion initiative, but back then it was aimed at unifying all of Europe for the sake of coming to a consensus on arms reduction. Russia initially welcomed this, and Putin himself considered having Russia join the alliance. By 2002, after 9/11, the war on terror became another point of agreement between eastern and western Europe and a NATO alliance. But still, many insisted that this initiative by the US to expand NATO into Eastern Europe needlessly provokes Russia, and knew well in advance it could lead to growing tensions with Moscow if NATO began admitting Baltic states. During the Bush Administration's campaign to expand NATO, the US would admit former soviet republics in the Baltics in 2004. Once again, Russia had no problem here. Now in 2008, after it was clear that the US/NATO were overstepping their boundaries in the Middle East, the US declared its intention to have Georgia and Ukraine join NATO, a move that other NATO members like Germany and France considered detrimental to positive relations with Russia. At this point, Russia began to worry, warning the US and NATO that a military bloc at his borders won't be tolerated. Mind you, this was before the Crimea issue that every one was using to justify US provocation. It started before then. At this juncture in 2022, the US has established itself as an aggressive imperial country, and NATO expansion all of a sudden was not looking like the peace initiative it started out as. Then Obama Administration happened. During his administration, NATO/US basically instigated unrest in Syria and Libya by arming violent separatists with no intention of committing any long term positive change for those regions, leaving civilians there at the mercy of the violent Assad, ISIS and armed militia groups. At this point, Russia was completely alarmed, seeing that Syria was an ally

of Russia. NATO expansion had to stop, from Russia's standpoint. Russia began to become extremely concerned about its neighbors allying themselves with a powerful self-justified entity.

The Biden administration refused to take a conciliatory approach with Russia. In terms of quelling hostility, Biden was doing a wonderful job with Iran, attempting to re-establish agreements set up during the Obama administration. Why didn't he do that with Russia? Was it because the democrats were still stuck on the Trump pro-Russia narrative? After 2017, Trump was anything but. He threatened China and Russia with a nuclear arms race, and then proceeded to threaten Russia directly, stating an intention to withdraw the US from a cold war era nuclear arms treaty in 2018, before actually doing so in 2019. This on the heels on 15 years of NATO provocation of Russia. When Trump withdrew the US from that INF treaty, Russia no longer had any way of being assured that intermediate range ballistic missiles would not be deployed to his immediate neighbors in Ukraine and Georgia in the event that they join NATO. This was why Russia was so tense. Trump also imposed sanctions on Nord Stream 2 back in 2019 to keep Russia from supplying energy to Germany and thus exerting more influence in Europe. There was a massive dichotomy between Trump's pro-Putin rhetoric and his decisively anti-Russian policy. My question was, why didn't Biden lay off the threats and simply look to re-establish a nuclear arms treaty with Russia and undo that dangerous Donald Trump foreign policy. That seemed like a plausible first-step in de-escalation.

Russia and the US were both problematic when it came to arming violent separatists in other countries when it served their interests. Both know full well the consequences of doing so. In the past 20 years, however, the US had done more to instigate unrest throughout the world, including provoking Russia by expanding NATO into eastern Europe, amid numerous warning from Europe and foreign policy experts in the US. The US played a huge role in affecting Russia's policy towards Ukraine, seeing that Putin warned the US back in 2008, 6 years before the Crimea issue, that he would not tolerate a multi-national military bloc near his borders. The Russian build-up was more about deterring NATO than any specific intention to invade Ukraine. Who in their right mind would trust

the expansionist ambitions of the US/NATO, seeing how they destroyed entire nations in the Middle East with little to no justification. The US had been poking the bear for years.

Ukraine was a country that was in a civil war. This was not Russia vs Ukraine as of early 2022. This was a schism among Ukrainians—Ukrainian-speaking vs Russian-speaking. It was also perfectly legal for Russia to have their own military anywhere within their own borders, just as it was legal for NATO to line up and conducts military exercises near Russia's borders on a regular basis. The question was how far were both entities, NATO and Russia, willing to go to alarm the other. Both NATO and Russia needed to scale it down, which was something that only Russia had offered to do. Putin would consequently recognize the breakaway regions just prior to the Feb 24, 2022 invasion of Ukraine. This occurred on the heels of the Biden administration's decision to bring combative rhetoric to a diplomatic containment strategy that would have kept the war from happening. The Democrats needed to come to their senses. Biden had a history of trying to appeal to republican agenda in the name unity, and in the case of Russia he applied a strategy that a number of republicans had been looking to assert against Russia for years. It wasn't enough that Obama levied sanctions, or Trump pulled out of a nuclear treaty and armed the Ukrainians, or that NATO had been provoking Russia for years. That specific sector of republicans in the Republican Party were not going to be happy until someone insulted Russia directly with words. Biden had a history of trying to appeal to the Republican Party, and this time it would be costly. And seeing that many of the democrats were on board with his approach, it unified the two party system into a uni-party system in terms of the military industrial complex. Remember, Biden was anti-abortion and anti-gay marriage for years (until 2012) and prided himself on being the democrat that could reach republicans? He and Mitch McConnell worked together to solve the debt ceiling crisis in 2011. Biden also supported the war in Iraq. Now the country would likely rally around a common enemy that both the democrats and that specific sector of republicans would come to see in Russia. The drawback was that the American propaganda machine would have nothing to answer to.

It was typical Biden fashion to navigate both sides of the political spectrum in order to encourage moderate outlooks among both parties. This had been his modus operandi throughout his political career. This was why we had this conundrum of non-commitment of troop deployment to Ukraine, along with a hardline rhetoric against Russia. Biden really was trying to appeal to both sides, but this was a dangerous high wire act on his part. If he was successful, Russia would not have invaded, and at the same time, he Biden would won over the anti-Trump pro-war republican sector, while at the same time maintaining his base with the democrats. But he failed, and war was the result. Any momentum in the way of hardline militaristic non-diplomatic approach can now be allowed to fester in US foreign policy for years to come.

Looking back, we can see how Trump may have alarmed the Russian state by pulling out of a nuclear treaty and setting off another arms race. Keep in mind that it was not the democrats who initially lobbied for this type of confrontation with Russia. It was actually Mitt Romney and other republicans that had been lobbying for a direct confrontation with Russia for years. Obama and the democrats rebuffed and criticized Romney in 2012 for saying that Russia was our greatest geopolitical foe. Now the Democrats and the Romney types in the Republican Party had joined forces on getting tough with Russia. This getting tough essentially means war. The Democratic Party no longer carries the mantle of peacekeeper that it worked so hard to cultivate throughout the decades. But lets be honest, the US talks tough before the fact, but when women and little babies on both sides of the conflict start dropping like flies, these so called "get tough" people would be the first ones marching in the streets, begging for the war to end.

The provocational approach by the democrats was shocking because traditionally, they have always been an anti-war entity. If this is still the case, then one must presume that when the US continues to provoke Russia into further escalation, and then its proposed that US troops directly intervene in Ukraine, the democrats may attempt to gaslight those accusing them of fostering the bloodshed after years of shelling, needless civilian death, and the imminent threat of nuclear war. They could deny they ever supported a war in the first place, before virtue signaling in public,

proclaiming support for anti-war protesters, while forgetting they denied the power of diplomacy to de-escalate geopolitical tensions.

Russian President Vladimir Putin eventually declared war on Ukraine, which took many by surprise. US intel was correct that an invasion was imminent, but the rhetoric from Biden didn't help the situation, and of course the US didn't take Russia or their own advisors serious when they stated repeatedly how NATO expansion into eastern Europe would only provoke Russia. When GW Bush stated an intention to make Ukraine and Georgia a part of NATO back in 2008, Putin warned back then that he would not tolerate a multinational military bloc at his borders. Regardless, US intel was accurate about a Russian invasion, but ultimately there is a consortium, consisting of Russia, Iran, China, Latin America, Syria, the Houthis in Yemen, which would stifle Biden's efforts at diplomatic relations with Iran.

The Biden administration abandoned diplomacy right from the start, and the outcome of that was going to be war every single time. Biden was warned back in 2021 by 27 political organizations, many of them left leaning organizations, to back off the hostile reckless anti-Russia rhetoric. Now, the US has a new precedent in foreign policy where it become standard to solve conflicts with threats. Sure, in hindsight many would say Russia was going to do it anyway, but anyone who had followed this over the years know that the stage was being set for this, largely in part to willful provocation on the part of the west. At this point, there was no point in complaining about Trump's foreign policy approach with North Korea and Iran, because it was basically the same as Biden and the democrat's approach with Russia.

One of the policies with NATO was that if country was at war or having a border dispute, they cannot join. The purpose of this was to keep current NATO members from inheriting enemies. The US and Russia convinced Ukraine to give up its nuclear weapons back in the 1990s in exchange for security assurances. Looks like that was not going to be the case from either country.

Biden helped escalate the crisis in eastern Europe with dangerous rhetoric and then promised to help Ukraine if Russia advanced. Where was the help? Ukraine was under attack, but Biden was only sending troops to NATO countries. Once again, the

US makes such commitments and then walks away. That is not a conducive anti-war approach, because in such a case, one was assuring an ally and then breaking that promise. Yeah, one avoids war, but in turn misleads an ally about one's intentions. Why do that? Why not just apply conciliatory measures from the start, help de-escalate the crisis, and thus not need to falsely promise military intervention. Now the US cannot be trusted. Sure, the intel was right, but wrong about assuring Ukraine against Russian aggression.

US was obviously not going to respond in any meaningful way. That show of strength and commitment to Ukraine was exaggerated, and Ukraine would end up losing 20% of its territory. Had the US took the conciliatory approach from the start, offered to re-negotiate nuclear treaties and scale down NATO military exercises, they could have avoided both this scenario and the embarrassment of having spoke hard, while carrying a soft stick. Russia, on the other hand, may face a different type of consequences, such as a coup attempt if Russia's economy doesn't rebound. Russia, however, had more control over their propaganda and had likely persuaded Russians that NATO was the aggressor who had aided a nazification of Ukraine.

The US had been problematic for its allies all year in 2021 and 2022. First they ditched Saudi Arabia on the Yemen issue, then the western media went ahead and placed Hamas on a moral equivalency with Israel during the 2021 Gaza War. The US then abandoned their allies in Afghanistan. Now they were slow to aid Ukraine after months of combative rhetoric with Russia which ultimately dragged Ukraine into a war they never stood a chance at winning. France was angry, blaming the US for exporting woke culture into France, racializing the country, all the while conducting a back door nuclear submarine deal with Australia which upended a deal France was trying to attain. Germany never wanted Ukraine to join NATO fearing implications for their own country. America had a pattern of escalating crisis in another country and then falsely promising to intervene. If America does not want war, then it should eliminate all combative rhetoric from its foreign policy. What sense does it make to take an approach that provokes a conflict without any intention of fighting in it. Wouldn't it make more sense to tread carefully if one was not trying to stir the pot?

Shortly after the Russian invasion, Zelensky had stated that Ukraine had been left alone after having asked 27 European leaders. At the outset, it was clear that US/NATO only pledged to admit Ukraine for the sake of provoking and weakening Russia. Now that they had done this, they refuse to guarantee Ukraine's membership. It is sad and despicable. They could have refused to admit Ukraine before Russia's invasion, which would have drastically eased tensions, but of course they didn't. Had they simply refused to admit Ukraine, like Angela Merkel did when she was chancellor of Germany, NATO could have helped ease tensions and the likelihood of an all-out invasion. The assurances made by the US to Zelensky had given him the wrong impression. The US repeatedly stated they would defend Ukraine if Russia invaded. No one knew that such defense would be with sanctions and not military force. The nature and inflections of US rhetoric and tone made it seem like they would disregard their own earlier decision not to commit troops to Ukraine.

Obviously Russia's grievances about NATO don't matter at this point. They chose to react with hyper aggression and brutality. Aggression nullifies everything, hence why Ghandi and MLK pushed non-violence to make their grievances known. This was why provocation was such a powerful weapon. Once the target gets angry, all the other precipitating factors that led to it were quickly forgotten.

If you haven't followed the last 20 years of US foreign policy, one can try to look back in hindsight and say Putin would have done it anyway. And this was ultimately the the goal of provocation. Once the subject reacts, all the precipitating factors would have no real relevancy on the matter, since the damage was already done. This "he would have done it anyway" was what Tony Blair and GW Bush tried to use in reference to Saddam Hussein to justify their invasion of Iraq. One has to remember Putin's policy on Ukraine didn't become an urgent matter until after 2008, when George W Bush declared NATO's intension to admit Ukraine and Georgia into the alliance. And this was actually to the dismay of other NATO countries like Germany and France, who considered this pledge as needlessly provoking Russia. Not only did they consider such a pledge seriously problematic, but so did numerous foreign policy

experts in the US, seeing that all that does was poke the bear. Now come 2011, when President Obama continues to assert disastrous US/NATO foreign policy by instigating a civil war in Libya. This was when NATO expansion into eastern Europe became problematic and continued insistence by the US that Ukraine join NATO only drew Ukraine further upon the ire of Russia. This was why Americans are calling for a third party. Republicans were too adamant on direct military confrontation with foreign countries, while the democrats, as was clearly the case, felt compelled to instigate wars within foreign countries.

After 1991, most Ukrainians never wanted any problems with Russia or Russian speakers living in their own country, hence why they voted 3 either pro-Russian or native Russian speakers to presidency. This was for the sake of quelling any discord. They just want to live their life. Its a small minority of nationalists in Ukraine that had maintained that anti-Russian perspective. That was not the status quo there. It was the US that was over-committing to these minority of violent separatists in other countries, arming them, helping them conduct coups, and destabilizing the country as a whole for their own political interests. The democrats had now done this twice. Its as if the Republicans were natural invaders, while the democrats were natural instigators. This had to stop. Most Ukrainians right now were trying to get to safety. They don't want to die in glory.

The whole point of NATO was to constrain Germany and Japan militarily, as well as the Soviet-communist expansion. That was out the window now. Once Germany develops its military capability to full capacity, they would either leave NATO or call all the shots.

US/NATO's only goal was to instigate, and not intervene. Very calculated move and sooo typical of their foreign policy. And now they were trying to salvage any semblance of honor by sending arms to Ukraine, which would only prolong Russian aggression in the area and further devastate Ukraine. And seeing that they would not protect Ukraine's airspace, NATO's actions even now were a continuation of their instigating, as leaving Ukraine's airspace defenseless almost negates the point of providing arms because without the higher ground, Ukraine ultimately had no chance.

Meanwhile, the US continued to buy Russian oil and gas,

allowing Russia to finance the conflict. There was a clear pattern here where the goal seemed to be to keep Russia angry at Ukraine without that anger spreading to other parts of the world, as opposed to simply complying with Russia's demands and stopping the bloodshed and preventing a nuclear war. The US could have ended this by refusing to admit Ukraine into NATO, which actually allows Ukraine to save face and Russia to pull out. The only sacrifice was that it looks like the US was deferring to Russia. Seems like a small inconvenience in exchange for saving millions of lives. But the US would not do this. What gives? Of course, one can try using the "Russia would have done it anyway" argument, but that opens a nasty door of pre-emptive justification that everyone gets to walk through. Russia could have taken over Georgia and Ukraine back in 2008 if they wanted to, or even further back in 1990s. It was pretty clear that this was all about Ukraine joining NATO.

This was not good. Biden's aggressive rhetoric with Putin had massive implications, as we see. Now, his combative rhetoric against the Crown Prince was already starting to backfire. The US was well aware of the importance of US relations with Saudi Arabia, and if this was the beginning of a strong rift between the US and Saudi Arabia, it would have an enormous negative impact on the US economy. This was something that could send gold through the roof. Saudi Arabia has so much clout that it was once classified how Saudi Arabia was abusing their position with the US, helping Saudis accused of crimes in the US evade the US Judicial process by extraditing them back to Saudi Arabia. These crimes included manslaughter, child pornography, and rape. Now Biden enters office by taking a hardline stance against the Crown Prince and threatening to prosecute him over the Khashoggi killing. He also vowed to cut US involvement in Yemen, and at the same time continue to ignore the Yemen issue in nuclear talks with Iran. His approach on these issues could lead to Saudi Arabia cutting ties with the US. Many don't realize that if Saudi doesn't sell their oil for US Dollars, there would be no global demand for US dollars, and hence there would be no way we could the print infinite amounts of currency that we are currently printing. The consequences would be devastating.

The US and the west was going to be blamed regardless, and the

world was already beginning to distrust the US. Saudi Arabia was a prime example, as they were flirting with the possibility to selling their oil for Chinese Yuan. That was unprecedented. The dollar's strength was dependent on Saudi oil, since they were the largest exporter of crude oil in the world. They help increase global demand for USD by selling their oil for US dollars. This global demand allows the US to print money en masse without much threat to the dollar's value. This would change if Saudi Arabia cuts ties and decides to sell their oil for something else.

Democrats cheering on Ukraine from the sidelines makes no difference. Even Zelensky had stated amidst all this outpouring of moral support from the west, that while Russia was to be blamed for civilian casualties, the west would share in the responsibility: "While Russians were to blame for the killings, responsibility was shared by those who for 13 days in their Western offices haven't been able to approve an obviously necessary decision, who didn't save our cities from these bombs and missiles – although they can." He had been more outspoken than anyone as far as implicating the west and NATO for civilian deaths in Ukraine. And now he had flat out said that Ukraine would not join NATO, upending any chance that NATO would intervene for a non-member state. If NATO wouldn't intervene for an applicant, all the more likely they won't intervene for a non-candidate. This was the worst foreign policy disaster in US history and it was already coming back to haunt us where it hurts, at our alliance with Saudi Arabia, something that experts have been warning about for years.

Biden later said that Putin 'cannot remain in power.' This was a dangerous thing to say because Putin can use what Biden said to justify his policy, which was why the White House moved quickly to clarify what Biden said. The Kremlin could have pointed to Biden's statement and say "look, the US had always sought regime change in Russia, and this why we had to take such drastic action to keep Ukraine from joining NATO" Biden was obviously referring to the post invasion circumstances and war crimes committed by Russia against Ukraine for his sentiment that Putin should not be in power. However, being president requires consideration on how words may be construed to someone else's advantage. Many point to Russia's invasion of Ukraine as something that had always been in the works

because of the fact that it actually happened. None of those recent developments just prior to February 24, 2022 had been taken into consideration as the primary catalyst. So it was likely because of the fact that Biden said what he said, Putin would argue that regime change in Russia had always been the agenda of the US, irrespective of any recent developments that could justify Biden's statement. While the US lied and stated that they do not have a regime change policy, evidence shows that they do. Obama told Gaddafi to flat out "step down." Not only that, the Obama administration also recognized the rebels in Syria as the legitimate governing authority of the country. If that was not regime change policy, then what do you call it? Libya and Syria shows that the US clearly had a open regime change policy.

That fact that the US can generation after generation convince the American public that their actions and policies overseas are justified is really extraordinary. The American public never gets it right in real time, always after the fact, when its too late. And to think, democrats complain about republican nationalism. They should look in the mirror now. The democrats were either more nationalistic than they give themselves credit for, or were just suffering from Trump derangement syndrome where they had to align themselves with any perspective they feel distances themselves from Trump, regardless of what it was. When Trump was president, everyone was under the impression that the democrats were the solution to bad US foreign policy. But that was not the case. The democrats were in fact the opposite.

American foreign policy was a disaster. This had been true when republicans were in office and when democrats were in office. Yet each party seems to think this fact magically disappears when their party holds office. At the moment, the democrats had managed to forget the Iraq war, the hundreds of thousands of civilians killed by US forces, as well the atrocities committed by NATO in Libya and Syria and how those events played a role in shaping the geopolitical perception of NATO as a hostile impunitive military bloc. Democrats had managed to convince themselves that after all of that, other countries need had no worries about NATO deploying missiles at their doorstep. The fact that people can still willfully presume that the US/NATO was a trustworthy entity after

all that happened in the Middle East over the last 20 years was mind boggling.

The US was no different than Russia in not wanting any of its neighbors to have heavy weapons that could reach home soil. The US would invade Nicaragua or any Latin American country just for obtaining long range missiles, let alone actually using them. The US invaded a country simply because they thought they had long range missiles and that country was not even on the same continent as the US. Furthermore, the US criticizes Russia for being alarmed at NATO expansion and its closest neighbors being supplied missile systems, but at the same time, the US sits here and rationalizes for itself that same concern we criticize Russia for having. This US military industrial complex was the paragon of hypocrisy. Go figure, we actually have legislation that gives us the right to sanction countries that were supplying either Ethiopia or Tigray with weapons and thus prolonging and exacerbating that conflict. But yet, it was ok for the US to protract and escalate the war in Ukraine.

Throughout the Russia/Ukraine conflict, the democrats began using selective retention to completely ignore the role that US foreign policy had played in fomenting the crisis in Ukraine. They also tried to draw a broader overview of the geopolitics in eastern Europe in order to further downplay specifics that led to the conflict, specifics very much based on actions taken by the United States to instigate a conflict in that region. First specific was the US insisting on Ukraine joining NATO, when NATO as an organization knew well in advance that such a scenario would provoke Russian aggression. The second specific that they completely ignore was how the Trump administration arming Ukraine with heavy weapons and pulling out of a nuclear treaty with Russia further exacerbated mistrust between the US and Russia. In castigating Putin, the democrats mention Stalin over and over again and try to convince people with the same talking point used by the United States during the time of McCarthyism and the Vietnam war, talking points that many on the left, ironically at that time, didn't buy for one second—quite remarkable considering that the Soviet Union actually existed at that time. And now that the Soviet Union is past tense, they now think somehow such references are more relevant today when it comes to scaring people into buying into atrocious US foreign

policy.? It failed to work for the Vietnam war and it will not work now. Russia had no more right than the US to dictate what a sovereign country does within its own borders and who that country wants to ally itself with, and what weapons that country wants to attain for its own military. However, now all the pro-war entities in the US believe that only the US should be allowed to oppress other nations and decide what a sovereign nation should do in their own countries. They fail to see how this is a very problematic perspective that denotes an extreme double standard. Many want to give Ukraine a pass for using any means to defend and reclaim their lost territory when the US as a nation has designated other nations—trying to do the very same—as terrorists.

The democrats were anti-war when Trump was in office and kept pressure on Trump to avoid starting a military confrontation with North Korea and Iran. Not sure what happened to the democrats between then and now. Big-time shift. Now they were completely pro-war in every sense of the word. After the Russian invasion, the democrats started pushing Neo-McCarthyism and later it came out that the CIA/NATO was hosting an enemies of Ukraine list at myrotvorets.center. This site doxxes people it had concluded to be enemies of Ukraine. It even had American citizens on it who were advocating for a negotiated settlement. Oliver Stone and Noam Chomsky were on it for their comments about Ukraine. Also added was Roger Waters of Pink Floyd. They were being accused of being accomplices of the Russian invasion, even though none of them encouraged Russia to invade Ukraine. The democrats had established a new paradigm for their platform, reaching a point by which calling for peace became aiding the aggressor.

Trump Derangement Syndrome (TDS) was a real phenomenon. People shouldn't base their politics on strictly remaining contrary to Trump. Ever been in a heated argument with someone and unable to agree with anything the other person says regardless if you actually agree with it or not? That was essentially basis of TDS. This happens the other way as well. There were some in Republican Party that go against democrat moves simply because the democrats were doing it. Look at the all war monger ex-military guys against the war in Ukraine simply because the democrats were the ones leading the helm. And it wouldn't surprise me if when the

GOP wins in 2024, they would push forward by sending US troops to Ukraine. The GOP were not pacifists in any sense of the word and I think many who don't support the war in Ukraine see this, which was why many were beginning to see the democrats and republicans as a uni-party. If anyone thinks the GOP or Trump was the way out of the war in Ukraine, they may want to rethink that. Trump was not going to make the US look weak on the world stage by caving-in to Russia. Remember, Trump armed the Ukrainians in 2017 and already proposed sending nuclear submarines to Ukraine to help them fend off Russia.

The enabling of the war in Ukraine had become bi-partisan. Lindsey Graham had been the ringleader from day one. Biden made a huge mistake by promising Zelensky that the US would act "swiftly and decisively" if Russia invaded. This was essentially a pledge of commitment from the US to help Ukraine win the war. Now being this deep in, especially after having stifled peace talks back in March of 2022 (yes the US and UK advised Zelensky against it), the US was facing its biggest humiliation in history by failing to stop Russia from taking parts of Ukraine after having been perceived by the world to be the greatest military power. The value of our US dollar, im sorry to say, was backed by our ability to intervene militarily in foreign affairs on behalf of allies, namely Saudi Arabia. But if Saudi Arabia sees Ukraine as an example of the US's ability to protect an ally, then they may just throw away the petrodollar agreement and look for a new partner, and we all know the consequences of that. There was no out for the US anymore and the democrats and republicans had relegated peace to capitulation, Besides if Zelensky even considers a peace agreement with Russia, the far right in Ukraine would likely oust him very quickly. Ukraine, for the United States, was the US's attempt to clean up their reputation as an unreliable ally, especially after what had happened in Afghanistan, Libya and Syria. Unfortunately, with the annexations by Russia, the only option for the US in this regard is WWIII and a potential nuclear holocaust.

Bibliography

Goldstein, Joseph (November 20, 2016). "Alt-Right Exults in Donald Trump's Election With a Salute: 'Heil Victory'". The New York Times. Retrieved November 21, 2016.
Hawley 2017, p. 134; Niewert 2017, p. 328.

https://www.cnn.com/2016/07/08/politics/politicians-react-to-dallas-police-shooting-donald-trump/index.html

"Trump disavows 'alt-right' supporters". BBC News. November 22, 2016. Retrieved November 22, 2016.

Woolf, Nicky (November 23, 2016). "Donald Trump's 'alt-right' supporters express dismay at disavowal". The Guardian. Retrieved November 23, 2016.

Labott, Elise; Gaouette, Nicole (April 8, 2017). "After Syria strike, populist supporters abandon Trump at home and abroad". CNN. Retrieved April 8, 2017.

Anthony, Charles (April 7, 2017). "Trump supporters are not happy about missile strikes on Syria". Middle East Eye. Retrieved April 9, 2017.

Haag, Matthew (April 7, 2017). "Trump's Far-Right Supporters Turn on Him Over Syria Strike". The New York Times. Retrieved April 10, 2017.

"What is Black Lives Matter and what are the aims?". BBC News. June 12, 2021. Retrieved December 31, 2021.

Friedersdorf, Conor. "How to Distinguish Between Antifa, White Supremacists, and Black Lives Matter." The Atlantic. August 31, 2017. August 31, 2017.

"Black Lives Matter". Newsweek. Retrieved August 22, 2020.

Banks, Chloe (November 2, 2018). "Disciplining Black activism: post-racial rhetoric, public memory and decorum in news media framing of the Black Lives Matter movement". Continuum. 32 (6): 709–720. doi:10.1080/10304312.2018.1525920. ISSN 1030-4312. S2CID 150199510.

Rojas, Fabio (June 20, 2020).

"Moving beyond the rhetoric: a comment on Szetela's critique of the Black Lives Matter movement". Ethnic and Racial Studies. 43 (8): 1407–1413. doi:10.1080/01419870.2020.1718725. ISSN 0141-9870. S2CID 213636514.

Roberts, Frank (July 13, 2018).
"How Black Lives Matter Changed the Way Americans Fight for Freedom". American Civil Liberties Union. Retrieved June 15, 2020.

Charles Barkley: 'In shock' over election, but urges patience with Donald Trump https://abc7chicago.com/sports/charles-barkley-in-shock-over-election-but-urges-patience-with-donald-trump/1601446/

Collins, Ben; Mak, Tim (August 15, 2015). "Who Really Runs #BlackLivesMatter?". The Daily Beast. Retrieved December 18, 2016.
Leazenby, Lauren; Polk, Milan (September 3, 2020). "What you need to know about Black Lives Matter in 10 questions". Chicago Tribune. Retrieved November 4, 2020.

Wikipedia contributors. (2023, September 6). Hunter Biden laptop controversy. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 19:44, September 8, 2023, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Hunter_Biden_laptop_controversy&oldid=1174141331

Ford G. (2018). Talking to north korea : ending the nuclear standoff. Pluto Press.

Baker, Peter; Choe, Sang-Hun (August 8, 2017). "Trump Threatens 'Fire and Fury' Against North Korea if It Endangers U.S." The New York Times. Bedminster, New Jersey. Retrieved September 20, 2017.

"North Korea fires another missile over Japan, putting Guam within range". The Straits Times. Seoul, South Korea: Reuters, AFP, Washington Post. September 15, 2017. Retrieved September 20, 2017.

"Donald Trump, in first UN speech, warns US will 'totally destroy' North Korea if threatened". ABC News (Australia). September 19, 2017. Retrieved September 20, 2017.

Samuelson, Kate (September 22, 2017). "'Mentally Deranged.' Read Kim Jong Un's Entire Response to Donald Trump". Time. Retrieved September 29, 2017.

"North Korea says strike on US is 'inevitable' as Pentagon flies bombers off coast". foxnews.com. September 23, 2017. Retrieved September 23, 2017.

Wikipedia contributors. (2023, September 7). Black Lives Matter. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 19:42, September 8, 2023, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Black_Lives_Matter&oldid=1174236506

Wikipedia contributors. (2023, September 5). Indictments against Donald Trump. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 19:43, September 8, 2023, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Indictments_against_Donald_Trump&oldid=1174006105

Wikipedia contributors. (2023, September 2). Joe Biden classified documents incident. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 19:45, September 8, 2023, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Joe_Biden_classified_documents_incident&oldid=1173446368

Wikipedia contributors. (2023, September 3). Cabinet of Donald Trump. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 19:46, September 8, 2023, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Cabinet_of_Donald_Trump&oldid=1173610553

Wikipedia contributors. (2023, September 3). Syrian civil war. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 19:47, September 8, 2023, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Syrian_civil_war&oldid=1173551848

Wikipedia contributors. (2023, August 31). North Korea–United States relations. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 19:48, September 8, 2023, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=North_Korea%E2%80%93United_States_relations&oldid=1173197428

Wikipedia contributors. (2021, December 18). Russo-Ukrainian War. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 20:28, December 18, 2021, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Russo-Ukrainian_War&oldid=1060895101

Wikipedia contributors. (2021, December 18). Tatars. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 20:29, December 18, 2021, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php? title=Tatars&oldid=1060853966

Applebaum, Anne. Red Famine: Stalin's War on Ukraine. , 2017. Print.

Gregorovich, Andrew. Ukraine, Rus', Russia and Muscovy: A Selected Bibliography of the Names. Toronto: New Review Books, 1971. Print.

Rybakov, Boris. Kievan Rus. Moskva: Progress, 1989. Print.

Senyk, Sophia. A History of the Church in Ukraine: Volume I. Roma: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1993. Print.

Klid, Bohdan, and Alexander J. Motyl. The Holodomor Reader: A Sourcebook on the Famine of 1932-1933 in Ukraine. Toronto: CIUS Press, 2012. Print.

Wikipedia contributors. (2021, December 18). Kyiv. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 20:30, December 18, 2021, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Kyiv&oldid=1060850287

Wikipedia contributors. (2021, December 17). History of the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth (1648–1764). In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 20:30, December 18, 2021, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=History_of_the_Polish%E2%80%93Lithuanian_Commonwealth_(1648%E2%80%93176 4)&oldid=106073862

Wikipedia contributors. (2021, December 10). Khmelnytsky Uprising. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 20:31, December 18, 2021, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Khmelnytsky_Uprising&oldid=1059600556

Wilson, Andrew, and Igor Burakovsky. The Ukrainian Economy Under Kuchma. London: The Royal Institute of international affairs, 1996. Print.

Grimsted, Patricia K. Trophies of War and Empire: The Archival Heritage of Ukraine, World War Ii, and the International Politics of Restitution. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute,

2001. Print.

Wikipedia contributors. (2021, November 30). Battle of Zboriv (1649). In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 20:33, December 18, 2021, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Battle_of_Zboriv_(1649)&oldid=1057975106

Boshyk, Yuri, Roman Waschuk, and Andriy Wynnyckyj. Ukraine During World War Ii: History and Its Aftermath : a Symposium. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta, 1986. Print.

Wilson, Andrew, and Jakob Hauter. Civil War? Interstate War? HybridWar?: Dimensions and Interpretations of the Donbas Conflict in 2014-2020. , 2021. Print.

Wikipedia contributors. (2021, May 27). Treaty of Bila Tserkva. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 20:34, December 18, 2021, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Treaty_of_Bila_Tserkva&oldid=1025438980

Black Sea and Sea of Azov Pilot: Marmara Denizi, Black Sea and Sea of Azov with Adjacent Coasts of Turkey, Bulgaria, Romania, Ukraine, Russia and Georgia. , 2019. Print.

Service, Robert. The Last of the Tsars: Nicholas Ii and the Russian Revolution. , 2018. Print.

Tolstoy, Leo, and Jonathan Oliver. The Cossacks. , 2016. Sound recording.

Wikipedia contributors. (2021, November 11). Russians in Ukraine. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 20:34, December 18, 2021, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Russians_in_Ukraine&oldid=1054624206

Wikipedia contributors. (2021, December 11). Peter the Great. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 20:35, December 18, 2021, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Peter_the_Great&oldid=1059709376

Sakwa, Richard. Frontline Ukraine: Crisis in the Borderlands. , 2020. Internet resource.

Ross, Smith N. Eu-russian Relations and the Ukraine Crisis. , 2016.

Print.

Wilson, Andrew. Ukraine Crisis: What It Means for the West. , 2014. Print.

Wilson, Francesca M. Muscovy; Russia Through Foreign Eyes, 1553-1900. New York: Praeger, 1971. Print.

PLOKHY, SERHII. Lost Kingdom: A History of Russian Nationalism from Ivan the Great to Vladimir Putin. Place of publication not identified: PENGUIN Books, 2018. Print.

Wikipedia contributors. (2021, November 24). Russians. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 20:36, December 18, 2021, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Russians&oldid=1056992310

Wikipedia contributors. (2021, December 15). Grand Duchy of Moscow. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 20:36, December 18, 2021, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Grand_Duchy_of_Moscow&oldid=1060423056

Wikipedia contributors. (2021, November 20). Kievan Rus'. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 20:37, December 18, 2021, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Kievan_Rus%27&oldid=1056197909

Wikipedia contributors. (2021, December 9). History of Ukraine. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 20:37, December 18, 2021, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=History_of_Ukraine&oldid=1059383063

Delaere, A. Memorandum on the Attempts of Schism and Heresy

Among the Ruthenians (commonly Called "galicians") in the Canadian Northwest. Winnipeg: West Canada Pub, 2018. Internet resource.

Khar'kov VN, Stepanov VA, Borinskaia SA, Kozhekbaeva ZhM, Gusar VA, Grechanina EIa, Puzyrev VP, Khusnutdinova EK, Iankovskiĭ NK. Struktura genofonda vostochnykh Ukraintsev po gaplogruppam Y-khromosomy [Structure of the gene pool of eastern Ukrainians from Y-chromosome haplogroups]. Genetika. 2004 Mar;40(3):415-21.

Russian. PMID: 15125258.

Wikipedia contributors. (2021, December 10). Mazeppa. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 20:38, December 18, 2021, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Mazeppa&oldid=1059529863

Petro, Nicolai N. Ukraine in Crisis. , 2019. Print.
Kirchner, Walther. Russian History. New York, N.Y: Harper Perennial, 1991. Print.

Plokhy, Serhii. The Gates of Europe: A History of Ukraine. , 2021. Print.

Russell, Bertrand. Practice and Theory of Bolshevism. Forgotten Books,

2019. Internet resource.

Wikipedia contributors. (2021, December 2). Stanisław Leszczyński. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 20:38, December 18, 2021, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Stanis%C5%82aw_Leszczy%C5%84ski&oldid=1058260059

Marples, David R, and Frederick V. Mills. Ukraine's Euromaidan: Analyses of a Civil Revolution. , 2015. Internet resource.

Wikipedia contributors. (2021, December 8). Catherine the Great. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 20:39, December 18, 2021, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Catherine_the_Great&oldid=1059219845

Wikipedia contributors. (2021, December 17). Russification of Ukraine. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 20:39,

December 18, 2021, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Russification_of_Ukraine&oldid=1060766670

Platonova, Daria. The Donbas Conflict in Ukraine: Elites, Protest, and Partition. , 2022. Internet resource.

Yekelchyk, Serhy. The Conflict in Ukraine: What Everyone Needs to Know. , 2015. Print.

Wikipedia contributors. (2021, December 18). Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved

20:40, December 18, 2021, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Ukrainian_Greek_Catholic_Church&oldid=1060932725

Chirovsky, Nicholas L. F. Moscow's Russification of Ukraine: Papers and Articles. New York: Ukrainian congress committee of America, 1987. Print.

McCauley, Martin. Gorbachev. Harlow: Longman, 2001. Print.

Wikipedia contributors. (2021, December 12). Russo-Japanese War. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 20:40, December 18, 2021, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Russo-Japanese_War&oldid=1059944194

Wikipedia contributors. (2021, December 15). War in Donbas. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 20:41, December 18, 2021, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=War_in_Donbas&oldid=1060398706

Wikipedia contributors. (2021, December 18). Swedish invasion of Russia. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 20:42, December 18, 2021, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Swedish_invasion_of_Russia&oldid=1060928437

Wikipedia contributors. (2021, December 13). Azov Battalion. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 20:43, December 18, 2021, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Azov_Battalion&oldid=1060152654

The Rise of Muscovy
By Jeffrey L. Neal Copyright © Jeffrey L. Neal, 2006 The Holodomor Reader
Compiled and edited by Bohdan Klid and Alexander J. Motyl Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press Edmonton • 2012 • Toronto

Kryzhanivsky, Stepan Andriyovich , Yerofeyev, Ivan Alekseyevich , Zasenko, Oleksa Eliseyovich , Stebelsky, Ihor , Hajda, Lubomyr A. and Makuch, Andrij. "Ukraine". Encyclopedia Britannica, 29 Jun. 2021, https://www.britannica.com/place/Ukraine. Accessed 18 December 2021.

Kryzhanivsky, Stepan Andriyovich , Yerofeyev, Ivan Alekseyevich , Zasenko, Oleksa Eliseyovich , Stebelsky, Ihor , Hajda, Lubomyr A. and Makuch, Andrij. "Ukraine". Encyclopedia Britannica, 29 Jun. 2021, https://www.britannica.com/place/Ukraine. Accessed 18 December 2021.

Ukraine & Russia : a fraternal rivalry / Anatol Lieven.
Washington, DC : United States Institute of Peace Press, 1999.
DESCRIPTION xvi, 182 p. : map ; 23 cm.

Ukraine crisis : what it means for the West / Andrew Wilson.
PUBLICATION
New Haven : Yale University Press, [2014] ©2014

Ukrainian nationalism : politics, ideology, and literature, 1929-1956 / Myroslav Shkandrij.
PUBLICATION
New Haven ; London : Yale University Press, [2015] ©2015

Ukraine over the edge : Russia, the West and the "new Cold War" / Gordon M. Hahn.
VARIANT TITLE Russia, the West and the "new Cold War"

102 Imperial gamble : Putin, Ukraine, and the new Cold War / MarvinKalb.
PUBLICATION
Washington, D.C. : Brookings Institution Press, 2015.
DESCRIPTION
xix, 287 pages ; 25 cm

Internet Encyclopedia of Ukraine, 47 Queen's Park Crescent East, Suite B-12, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON M5S 2C3 Canada. Tel: (416) 946-7326; fax: (416) 978-2672 http://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/
Khmelnytsky quote from "Anthony's Treaty" taken from here http://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/ display.asp?

linkpath=pages%5CK%5CH %5CKhmelnytskyBohdan.htm

Ukraine: Birth of a Modern Nation
Author: Serhy Yekelchyk

Youtube Video: The Breakup of the Soviet Union Explained by History Scope https://www.youtube.com/watch? v=t2GmtBCVHzY&t

Youtube Video: Holodomor: Stalin's Secret Genocide (2016 documentary short) uploaded by Roman Kononenko

Wikipedia contributors. "Ukrainians." Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia, 13 Dec. 2021. Web. 23 Dec. 2021.

https://www.sandstoneam.com/insight/rise-of-the-petrodollar

THE U.S. DOLLAR'S ROLE AS THE WORLD'S RESERVE CURRENCY WAS FIRST ESTABLISHED IN 1944 WITH THE BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENT(book uses this source to explain 1973 petrodollar agreement)

Kevin L. Kliesen and David C. Wheelock, "Managing a New Policy Framework: Paul Volcker, the St. Louis Fed, and the 1979-82 War on Inflation," Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis Review, First Quarter 2021, pp. 71-97. https://doi.org/10.20955/r.103.71-97 (uses this source to explain Volcker and interest rates)

Wikipedia contributors. (2021, September 10). 1973–1974 stock market crash. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 21:19, March 10, 2022, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php? title=1973%E2%80%931974_stock_market_crash&oldid=1043567392

Wikipedia contributors. (2022, March 8). Gulf War. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 21:20, March 10, 2022, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php title=Gulf_War&oldid=1075986328 (uses this source to explain gulf war)

“The Mars Hypothesis” by Anthony of Boston (Much of Chapter 1 copies directly from this source with permission from the author)

“What sanctions are being imposed on Russia over Ukraine invasion?”

https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-60125659 (uses this source to explain sanctions against Russia)

“Reduce the Pentagon’s Dependence on China by Recharging US Battery, Electronics Industry” by Jeffrey Nadaner https://www.defenseone.com/ideas/2021/07/reduce-pentagons-dependence-china-recharging-us-battery-electronics-industry/183729/ (uses this source to explain battery importance on US defense)

“Before invasion, Ukraine’s lithium wealth was drawing global attention” Written by Hiroko Tabuchi https://indianexpress.com/article/world/before-invasion-ukraines- lithium-wealth-was-drawing-global-attention-7799024/ (book uses this for stating 500,000 tons lithium oxide in eastern Ukraine)

“Chinese Company Removed as Operator of Cobalt Mine in Congo”
New York Times article by

By Eric Lipton and Dionne Searcey https://www.nytimes.com/2022/02/28/world/congo-cobalt-mining-china.html (uses this to explain China cobalt mine)

Bernstein, Edward. “Reflections on Bretton Woods.” In The International Monetary System: Forty Years After Bretton Woods, 15-20. Boston: Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, May 1984. (uses this source)

Bordo, Michael D. "Gold Standard." In The Concise Encyclopedia of Economics. Library of Economics and Liberty. Article published 2008.

Bordo, Michael, Owen Humpage, and Anna J. Schwartz, "U.S. Intervention during the Bretton Wood Era: 1962 -1973," Working Paper 11-08, Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, Cleveland, Ohio, April 2011.

ARGONNE NATIONAL LABORATORY

Researchers eye manganese as key to safer, cheaper lithium-ion batteries
BY CHRISTINA NUNEZ | JUNE 4, 2020
https://www.anl.gov/article/researchers-eye-manganese-as-key-to-safer-cheaper-lithiumion-batteries

Eichengreen, Barry. Exorbitant Privilege: The Rise and Fall of the Dollar and the Future of the International Monetary System. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

“Oil, weapons and realpolitik: Why some countries want to stay on friendly terms with Russia” By Dan De Luce

https://www.nbcnews.com/news/world/even-us-allies-are-reluctant-confront-russia-invasion-ukraine-rcna20686

Lessons from the Collapse of the Ruble Zone Anders Aslund PDF https://www.ifo.de/DocDL/forum-2016-4-aslund-ruble-zone-collapse-december.pdf

Afghan commander says army was 'betrayed by politics and presidents' BY MYCHAEL SCHNELL - 08/25/21 2:10 PM ET https://thehill.com/policy/international/569386-afghan-commander-says-army-was-betrayed-by-politics-and-presidents/

Wikipedia contributors. (2022, March 21). Withdrawal of United States troops from Afghanistan (2020–2021). In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 15:04, April 9, 2022, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Withdrawal_of_United_States_troops_from_Afghanistan_(2020%E2%80%932021)&oldid=1078361536

Twin Deficits and the Fate of the US Dollar: A Hard Landing Reexamined by Rod Thompson https://jpia.princeton.edu/sites/jpia/files/2008-6.pdf

https://www.forbes.com/sites/afontevecchia/2011/09/08/what-would-happen-if-germany-seceded-from-the-eu/

https://www.dw.com/en/germany-commits-100-billion-to-defense-spending/a-60933724

Kenen, Peter. "Bretton Woods System." In The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics, Second Edition, edited by Steven N. Durlauf and Lawrence E. Blume. Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Meltzer, Allan H. "U.S. Policy in the Bretton Woods Era." Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis Review 73, no. 3 (May/June 1991): 54-83.

Patinkin, Don. "Keynes, John Maynard (1883–1946)." In The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics, Second Edition, edited by Steven N. Durlauf and Lawrence E. Blume. Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

"Stasi State or Workers' Paradise – socialism in the German Democratic Republic and what became of it" by Bruni de la Motte & John GreenFirst published in Britain in 2015 Copyright © John Green & Bruni de la Motte

Wikipedia contributors. (2021, July 21). Economic history of the

German reunification. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 13:49, April 4, 2022, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Economic_history_of_the_German_reunification&oldid=1034725466 April 2019 Country report Middle East and North Africa Department

“Saudi Arabia’s Perspectives on Germany: Perceptions and Future

Potential for Cooperation” written by René Rieger & Sebastian Sons(book uses this source to explain Germany’s relations with Saudi Arabia)

Caldwell, P. C., & Hanshew, K. (2018). Germany since 1945: Politics, culture, and society. (uses this book to explain west german constitution)

“World's largest hydro dam 'could send cheap green hydrogen from Congo to Germany'” By Bernd Radowitz https://www.rechargenews.com/transition/worlds-largest-hydro-dam-could-send-cheap-green-hydrogen-from-congo-to-germany/2-1-871059

Creation of the Bretton Woods System by Sandra Kollen Ghizoni, Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta https://www.federalreservehistory.org/essays/bretton-woods-created (book uses this source)

Ousted President Is 'Ready To Fight For The Future Of Ukraine' February 28, 20148:30 AM ET MARK MEMMOTT https://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2014/02/28/2838781 94/ousted-president-is-ready-to-fight-for-the-future-of-ukraine

US officials say lethal weapons headed to Ukraine https://www.cnbc.com/2017/12/23/us-officials-say-lethal-weapons-headed-to-ukraine.html

Fedir Zhuravka, Rostislav Botvinov, Marharyta Parshyna, Tetiana Makarenko and Natalia Nebaba (2021). Ukraine’s integration into the world arms market. Innovative Marketing , 17(4), 146-158. doi:10.21511/im.17(4).2021.13

https://www.bbc.com/news/world-15572775 Russia angry at Viktor Bout's US guilty verdict

June 2018 edition of the Finance and Development Journal pg 14

https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/fandd/2018/06/pdf/

fd0618.pdf

“Understanding Russian Priorities in Latin America” by Vladimir Rouvinski https://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/media/documents/publication/ ki_170117_cable_russia_latin_american_v1.pdf

(Document by R. Craig Nation is from NATO’s official website nato.int) https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news_25864.htm? selectedLocale=en

Here is the url for the PDF: https://www.nato.int/acad/fellow/98-00/nation.pdf (book uses this source for quote about NATO provocation)

Wikipedia contributors. (2022, March 15). Houthi takeover in Yemen. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 12:20, April 12, 2022, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php? title=Houthi_takeover_in_Yemen&oldid=1077329319 (uses this source for information about Yemen)

“Ukraine: Russian Forces’ Trail of Death in Bucha Preserving Evidence Critical for War Crimes Prosecutions” https://www.hrw.org/news/2022/04/21/ukraine-russian-forces-trail-death-bucha (This source was used in to explain how Human Rights Watch documented the Bucha Massacre)

Wikipedia contributors. (2022, June 19). 2014 Odessa clashes. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 16:11, June 21, 2022, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.phptitle=2014_Odessa_clashes&oldid=1093953691 (This source was used to explain the Odessa fire in the Introduction section)

Ukrainian unrest spreads as dozens killed in Odessa https://www.france24.com/en/20140502-dozens-killed-building-fire-ukraine-odessa-clashes-pro-russia-activists (This source was used to explain the Odessa fire)

https://carnegieeurope.eu/2018/09/12/how-eastern-ukraine-is-adapting-and-

surviving-case-of-kharkiv-pub-77216
(This source was used to explain the situation in Kharkiv prior to Feb 24, 2022)

Wikipedia contributors. (2022, April 20). Criticism of Human Rights Watch. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 16:18, June 21, 2022, from
https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Criticism_of_Human_Rights_Watch&oldid=1083779764
(This source was used to explain criticism of HRW)

SUMMARY KILLINGS DURING THE CONFLICT IN EASTERN UKRAINE by Amnesty International

https://www.amnesty.eu/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Ukraine. pdf

(this source was used to explain Ukraine's war crimes in the Donbas region before Russian invasion)

"HE'S NOT COMING BACK" WAR CRIMES IN NORTHWEST AREAS OF KYIV OBLAST First published in 2022 by Amnesty International Ltd Peter Benenson House, 1 Easton Street, London WC1X 0DW, UK(this report was used asa source in other areas of the book)

100,000 Iraqi civilians dead, says study -
Article by Sarah Boseley
https://www.theguardian.com/world/2004/oct/29/iraq.sarahboseley (this source was used)

Iraq's bloodiest battle will be a video game By Alaa Elassar, CNN https://lite.cnn.com/en/article/h_be54549e672188884b44322316d0777a (this source was used to explain war crimes by US soldiers)

Wikipedia contributors. (2022, June 13). Mahmudiyah rape and killings. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 16:54, June 21, 2022, from
https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Mahmudiyah_rape_and_killings&oldid=1092983734
(uses this source to explain rapes carried out by US soldiers)

The Haditha shootings: What the witnesses saw by Josh White
https://www.seattletimes.com/nation-world/the-haditha-shootings-what-the-witnesses-saw/

(this source is used to explain the Haditha Massacre)

https://carnegieeurope.eu/2018/09/12/how-eastern-ukraine-is-adapting-and-surviving-case-of-kharkiv-pub-77216
LIBYA THE FORGOTTEN VICTIMS OF NATO STRIKES Amnesty International 2012
https://www.amnesty.org/en/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/mde 190032012en.pdf
(uses this source to explain NATO war crimes)

https://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/reports/natbm002.pdf
CIVILIAN DEATHS IN THE NATO AIR CAMPAIGN

Who is Viktor Medvedchuk and why does his arrest matter to the Kremlin?
https://www.theguardian.com/world/2022/apr/13/viktor-medvedchuk-arrest-matter-to-kremlin
(uses this source to explain capture of Medvedchuk)

Putin says Russia to use Middle East volunteer fighters
https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/putin-says-volunteers-welcome-help-fight- against-ukrainian-forces-2022-03- 11/ (uses this source to explain how Reuters calls Russian volunteers mercenaries)

American fighters who surrendered in Donbass speak to RT
https://www.rt.com/news/557340-us-fighters-captured-ukraine/
(uses this source to document how Russian fighters captured American volunteers in Ukraine)

American Fighters, Ukraine, and the Neutrality Act: The Law and the Urgent Need for Clarity by Dakota Rudesill
https://www.justsecurity.org/80612/american-fighters-ukraine-and-the-neutrality-act-the-law-and-the-urgent-need-for-clarity/ (used this source to explain the Neutrality Act)

Ukraine war: Britons Aiden Aslin and Shaun Pinner sentenced to death
https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-61745556 (uses this source)

Wikipedia contributors. (2022, June 21). 2022 Russian invasion of Ukraine. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 16:44, June 21, 2022, from
https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=2022_Russian_invasion_of_Ukraine&oldid=1094244748

(This source was used to document the Russian war in Ukraine and other events)

Wikipedia contributors. (2022, June 21). Siege of Mariupol. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 16:45, June 21, 2022, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Siege_of_Mariupol&oldid=1094257054 (this source was used to explain the siege of Mariupol)

Wikipedia contributors. (2022, June 21). Battle of Sievierodonetsk (2022). In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 16:47, June 21, 2022, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Battle_of_Sievierodonetsk_(2022)&oldid=1094229854 (uses this source to explain battle of Sievierodonetsk)

Wikipedia contributors. (2022, June 20). Bucha massacre. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 16:48, June 21, 2022, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Bucha_massacre&oldid=1094073072 (uses this source to summarize the Bucha massacre)

Wikipedia contributors. (2022, June 11). Nisour Square massacre. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 16:50, June 21, 2022, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Nisour_Square_massacre&oldid=1092571806 (uses this source to explain the Blackwater massacre)

TORTURE BY THE UNITED STATES The Status of Compliance by the U.S. Government with the International Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman and Degrading Treatment or Punishment Submitted to the United Nation's Committee Against Torture in conjunction with the expected filing by the U.S. Government in January, 2005 of their report on compliance with CAT standards by The World Organization for Human Rights USA Morton Sklar, Executive Director and Jenny-Brooke Condon, Litigation Director January 2005 https://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrc/docs/ngos/wohr.p df (uses this source to describe US tortures of detainees)

NATO/FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA "COLLATERAL DAMAGE" OR UNLAWFUL KILLINGS? Violations of the Laws of War by NATO during

Operation Allied Force (uses this source)

Subterranean Warfare: A Counter to U.S. Airpower by Donald M. Heilig

Sharma P, Penney DG. Effects of ethanol in acute carbon monoxide poisoning. Toxicology. 1990 May 31;62(2):213-26. doi: 10.1016/0300-483X(90)90111-S. PMID: 2353360

Yingchao Wang, Shunhua Zheng, Yongliang Li, Yueming Wang & Yanhua Huang (2021) The failure characteristics around shallow buried tunnels under rainfall conditions, Geomatics, Natural Hazards and Risk,

12:1, 363-380, DOI: 10.1080/19475705.2021.1875058

Online Video YouTube International institute for Counter Terrerism (ICT) “The International Working Group on Subterranean Warfare

Conference”

A UKRAINIAN INSURGENCY WILL BE LONG AND BLOODY

Thomas B. Pepinsky | 03.03.22 https://mwi.usma.edu/a-ukrainian-insurgency-will-be-long-and-bloody/ (paraphrased heavily)

Wikipedia contributors. "2022 Russian invasion of Ukraine." Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia, 5 Mar. 2022. Web. 5 Mar. 2022.

Implementation of Driverless Car Using Haar Cascade Algorithm
“Harshada Kashid1”, ”Ashwini Pujari 2i”,”Farheen Mujawar3”,”Hafsa Majgaonkar4”
123“ Student, Department of Computer Science Engineering, Jaywant College of Engineering and Polytechnic, K.M.Gad, Sangli, Maharastra, India “4”Assitant Professor, Department of computer Science Engineering, Jaywant College of Engineering and Polytechnic, K.M.Gad, Sangli, Maharastra, India” https://www.irjet.net/archives/V8/i6/IRJET-V8I6558.pdf

The Social Costs of Currency Counterfeiting Nathan Viles, Alexandra Rush and Thomas Rohling
https://www.rba.gov.au/publications/rdp/2015/pdf/rdp2015-05.pdf

https://www.thedrive.com/the-war-zone/31822/upgraded-israeli-iron-

dome-defense-system-swats-down-100-percent-of-targets-in-tests

The Islamic State has tunnels everywhere. It's making ISIS much harder to defeat. Analysis by Amanda Erickson https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2017/0 4/14/the-islamic-state-has-tunnels-everywhere-its-making-them-much-harder-to-defeat

https://www.army-technology.com/projects/patriot/

https://www.theverge.com/2013/2/21/4016416/al-qaeda-22-suggestions-for-dealing-with-drones

Royal United Services Institute for Defence and Security Studies Ukraine at War Paving the Road from Survival to Victory Jack Watling and Nick Reynolds https://static.rusi.org/special-report-202207-ukraine-final-web.pdf

Wounded Ukrainian soldiers reveal steep toll of Kherson offensive By John Hudson September 7, 2022 at 2:00 a.m. EDT https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/2022/09/07/ukraine-kherson-offensive-casualties-ammunition/

U.S. dials up shipments of radar-hunting missiles for Ukraine
By Dan Lamothe
https://www.washingtonpost.com/national-security/2022/09/08/ukraine-harms-missiles/

Why a fractured Taliban is endangering the U.S. mission in Afghanistan By Shawn Snow
https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/checkpoint/wp/2015/12/21/why-a-fractured-taliban-is-endangering-the-u-s-mission-in-afghanistan/

Afghanistan's military collapse: Illicit deals and mass desertions
By Susannah George
https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/2021/08/15/afghanistan-military-collapse-taliban/

Russia's Chechen Wars 1994-2000 Lessons from Urban Combat
by Olga Oliker
https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monograph_reports/MR1289/RAND_MR1289.pdf

Wikipedia contributors. (2022, August 16). Aslan Maskhadov. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 15:35, September 10, 2022, from

https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Aslan_Maskhadov&oldid=1104690027

Wikipedia contributors. (2022, July 3). Russia–Chechnya Peace Treaty. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 15:36, September 10, 2022, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Russia%E2%80%93Chechnya_Peace_Treaty&oldid=1096337583

Wikipedia contributors. (2022, September 4). First Chechen War. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 15:36, September 10, 2022, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=First_Chechen_War&oldid=1108437191

Wikipedia contributors. (2022, July 17). Algerian Civil War. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 15:37, September 10, 2022, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Algerian_Civil_War&oldid=1098761499

Wikipedia contributors. (2022, September 10). Myrotvorets. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 15:37, September 10, 2022, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php? title=Myrotvorets&oldid=1109463394

Wikipedia contributors. (2022, September 8). Second Chechen War. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 15:38, September 10, 2022, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Second_Chechen_War&oldid=1109134044

Wikipedia contributors. (2022, August 27). Russian apartment bombings. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 15:39, September 10, 2022, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Russian_apartment_bombings&oldid=1106951554

Wikipedia contributors. (2022, August 31). Shamil Basayev. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 15:39, September 10, 2022, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Shamil_Basayev&oldid=1107687716

Wikipedia contributors. (2022, June 27). Iraq–Syria relations. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 15:39, September 10, 2022, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Iraq

%E2%80%93Syria_relations&oldid=1095353304

Wikipedia contributors. (2022, August 27). Dmytro Yarosh. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 15:40, September 10, 2022, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Dmytro_Yarosh&oldid=1107058778

Wikipedia contributors. (2022, August 18). Georgian Civil War. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 15:40, September 10, 2022, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Georgian_Civil_War&oldid=1105135932

Wikipedia contributors. (2022, September 9) . Right Sector. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 15:41, September 10, 2022, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Right_Sector&oldid=1109436038

Wikipedia contributors. (2022, August 21). Ukrainian National Assembly – Ukrainian People's Self-Defence. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 15:41, September 10, 2022, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Ukrainian_National_Assembly_ %E2%80%93_Ukrainian_People%27s_Self-Defence&oldid=1105686550

Wikipedia contributors. (2022, May 16). Camp David Accords. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 15:41, September 10, 2022, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Camp_David_Accords&oldid=1088224510

Wikipedia contributors. (2022, September 9). Stepan Bandera. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 15:42, September 10, 2022, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Stepan_Bandera&oldid=1109430708

Wikipedia contributors. (2022, August 12). Russo-Georgian War. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 15:42, September 10, 2022, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Russo-Georgian_War&oldid=1104048449

Wikipedia contributors. (2022, September 3). United States involvement in regime change. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 15:42, September 10, 2022, from

https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=United_States_involvement_in_regime_change&oldid=1108226547

Wikipedia contributors. (2022, September 7). Proposed Russian annexation of South Ossetia. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 15:43, September 10, 2022, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Proposed_Russian_annexation_of_South_Ossetia&oldid=1108930425

Wikipedia contributors. (2022, September 2). Sadrist Movement. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 15:43, September 10, 2022, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Sadrist_Movement&oldid=1108059250

Wikipedia contributors. (2022, September 4). 2019–2021 Iraqi protests. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 15:43, September 10, 2022, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=2019%E2%80%932021_Iraqi_protests&oldid=1108407216

Leukocytosis: Basics of Clinical Assessment by NEIL ABRAMSON, M.D., and BECKY MELTON, M.D., Baptist Regional Cancer Institute, Jacksonville, Florida Am Fam Physician. 2000 Nov 1;62(9):2053-2060.

Instituto Gulbenkian de Ciencia. "Mystery solved: How sickle hemoglobin protects against malaria." ScienceDaily. ScienceDaily, 29 April 2011. <www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2011/04/110428123931.htm

Gatto I, Biagioni E, Coloretti I, et al. Cytomegalovirus blood reactivation in COVID-19 critically ill patients: risk factors and impact on mortality. Intensive Care Med. 2022;48(6):706-713. doi:10.1007/s00134-022-06716-y

Mehdi Nouraie, Sergei Nekhai, Victor R Gordeuk. Sickle cell disease is associated with decreased HIV but higher HBV and HCV comorbidities in US hospital discharge records: a cross- sectional study. Sexually Transmitted Infections. 2012; 88: 528-533.

Source: https://sahlgrenska.gu.se/english/research/news- events/news-article//antioxidants-in-the-diet-can-worsen-cancer. cid1201629

Source: Wu Q-J, Xiang Y-B, Yang G, Li H-L, Lan Q, Gao Y-T, et al. Vitamin E intake and the lung cancer risk among female nonsmokers: A report from the Shanghai Women's Health Study. Int J Cancer. 2015;136:610-7. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijc.29016.

Source: Increased risk of leukemia among sickle cell disease patients in California Ann Brunson, Theresa H. M. Keegan, Heejung Bang, Anjlee Mahajan, Susan Paulukonis, Ted Wun Blood. 2017 Sep 28; 130(13): 1597-1599. Prepublished online 2017 Aug 22. doi: 10.1182/blood-2017-05-783233 PMCID: PMC5620417.

Source: Risk of individual malignant neoplasms in patients with sickle cell disease: English national record linkage study. Seminog 00, Ogunlaja OI, Yeates D, Goldacre MJ J R Soc Med. 2016 Aug; 109(8):3039.

Source: Ecole Polytechnique Federale de Lausanne. "Treating colon cancer with Vitamin A." ScienceDaily. ScienceDaily, 14 December 2015. < www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2015/12/151214130400.htm>.

Lacy ME, Wellenius GA, Sumner AE, et al. Association of Sickle Cell Trait With Hemoglobin Ale in African Americans. JAMA. 2017;317(5):507-515. doi:10.1001/jama.2016.21035

International Association for the Study of Lung Cancer. "Lung cancer patients with diabetes show prolonged survival." ScienceDaily. ScienceDaily, 18 October 2011. < www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2011/10/111017092235.htm>.

" -https:/ /www.ascopost.com/News/59006.

Ullah H, Akhtar M, Hussain F.. Journal of Tumor 2015; 4(1): 354-358 Available from: URL: http://www.ghrnet.org/index.php/jt/article/view/1340.

https://bmccardiovascdisord.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.11.86/s12872-015-0047-8

Gabrielli M, Franza L, Bungaro MC, Cunzo TD, Esperide A, et al. (2020) Duodenal bleeding in a patient with Covid-19-Related Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome. Arch Gerontol Geriatr Res 5(1): 036-039. DOI: 10.17352/aggr.000024

Sanku K, Siddiqui A, Paul V, et al. (March 15, 2021) An Unusual Case of

Gastrointestinal Bleeding in a Patient With COVID-19. Cureus 13(3): e13901. doi:10.7759/cureus.13901

Chen T, Yang Q, Duan H. A severe coronavirus disease 2019 patient with high-risk predisposing factors died from massive gastrointestinal bleeding: a case report. BMC Gastroenterol. 2020;20(1):318. Published 2020 Sep 29. doi:10.1186/s12876-020-01458-x

Source: Harvard University. "Simple Test Predicts Heart Attack Risk: White Blood Cells Sound A New Alarm." ScienceDaily. ScienceDaily, 25 March 2005. < www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2005/ 03/ 050323134019.htm>.

Baden, M.Y., Imagawa, A., Iwahashi, H. et al. Risk factors for sudden death and cardiac arrest at the onset of fulminant type 1 diabetes mellitus. Diabetol Int 7, 281–288 (2016). https://doi.org/10.1007/s13340-015-0247-6

Source: Judith A. Whitworth, Relationship between white blood cell count and incident hypertension, American Journal of Hypertension, Volume 17, Issue 9, September 2004, Page 861, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjhyper.2004.05.021.

Zhang T, Jiang Y, Zhang S, et al. The association between homocysteine and ischemic stroke subtypes in Chinese: A meta-analysis. Medicine (Baltimore). 2020;99(12):e19467. doi:10.1097/MD.0000000000019467

Rongioletti M, Baldassini M, Papa F, Capoluongo E, Rocca B, Cristofaro RD, Salvati G, Larciprete G, Stroppolo A, Angelucci PA, Cirese E, Ameglio F. Homocysteinemia is inversely correlated with platelet count and directly correlated with sE- and sP-selectin levels in females homozygous for C677T methylenetetrahydrofolate reductase. Platelets. 2005 May-Jun;16(3-4):185-90. doi: 10.1080/09537100400020187. PMID: 16011963.

**Elevated total homocysteine is associated with increased platelet activation at the site of microvascular injury: effects of folic acid administration A. UNDAS, E. STĘPIEŃ, D. PLICNER, L. ZIELINSKI, W. TRACZ
First published: 26 February 2007 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1538-7836.2007.02459.x**

Vitamin B12 and/or Folate Deficiency is a Cause of Macro Thrombocytopenia Anupama Jaggia and Adrian Northern

Seyoum M, Enawgaw B, Melku M. Human blood platelets and viruses:

defense mechanism and role in the removal of viral pathogens. Thromb J. 2018;16:16. Published 2018 Jul 17. doi:10.1186/s12959-018-0170-8

Association of alcohol consumption with white blood cell count: a study of Japanese male office workers N. Nakanishi, H. Yoshida, M. Okamoto, Y. Matsuo, K. Suzuki, K. Tatara
https:/ /doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2796.2003.01112.x

(Effect of caffeine supplementation on haematological and biochemical variables in elite soccer players under physical stress conditions Adriana Bassini-Cameron, Eric Sweet, Altamiro Bottino, Christina Bittar, Carlos Veiga, and Luiz-Claudio Cameron doi:10.1136/bjsm.2007.035147).

Hyperdopaminergic state in alcoholism Natalie Hirth, Marcus W. Meinhardt, Hamid R. Noori, Humberto Salgado, Oswaldo Torres Ramirez, Stefanie Uhrig, Laura Broccoli, Valentina Vengeliene, Martin Roflmanith, Stephanie Perreau-Lenz, Georg Kohr, Wolfgang H. Sommer, Rainer Spanagel, Anita C. Hansson Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences Feb 2016, 201506012; DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1506012113.

Source: Drinking A little Whiskey Might Actually Help Relieve Cold Symptoms - by Kate Bratskier of HuffPost.

Source: WebMD Medical Reference Reviewed by James Beckerman, MD, FACC on October 10, 2017.

Example: Habitual coffee consumption and blood pressure: an epidemiological perspective. Geleijnse JM1. PMID:19183744 PMCID:PMC2605331 DOI: 10.2147/vhrm.s3055.

Caffeine From Tea And Coffee Lowers Blood Pressure: Researchers Say 4 Cups A Day Does The Deed by Samantha Olsen of www.medicaldaily.com. “Metabolic syndrome induced by anticancer treatment in childhood cancer survivors” Hee Won Chueh, MD, PhD Jae Ho Yoo, MD, PhD Ann Pediatr Endocrinol Metab. 2017 Jun; 22(2): 82-89.

LDL-C does not cause cardiovascular disease: a comprehensive review of the current literature Uffe Ravnskov, Michel de Lorgeril, David M Diamond, Rokuro Hama, Tomohito Hamazaki, Bjorn Hammarskjold, Niamh Hynes, Malcolm Kendrick, Peter H Langsjoen, Luca Mascitelli, Kilmer S Mccully, Harumi Okuyama ORCID Icon, Paul J Rosch, Tore Schersten, Sherif Sultan & Ralf Sundberg Published online: 11 Oct 2018.

American College of Cardiology. "Low LDL cholesterol is related to cancer risk." ScienceDaily. ScienceDaily, 26 March 2012. < www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2012/03/120326113713.htm>.

Setor K Kunutsor, Samuel Seidu, Kamlesh Khunti. Statins and primary prevention of venous thromboembolism: a systematic review and meta-analysis. The Lancet Haematology, 2017; DOI: 10.1016/S2352-3026(16)30184-3.

https://www.henryford.com/news/2020/07/hydro-treatment-study

https://www.webmd.com/lung/news/20200827/blood-thinnersmay-increase-covid-survival-rates

https://www.fiercebiotech.com/research/how-covid-19-could-be-crippled-by-age-old-blood-thinner

https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-remdesivir/gileadfda-could-expand-remdesivir-use-despite-mixed-dataidUSKBN25H2CT

Nagy IZ, Lustyik G, Nagy VZ, Zarándi B, Bertoni-Freddari C. Intracellular Na^+:K^+ ratios in human cancer cells as revealed by energy dispersive x-ray microanalysis. J Cell Biol. 1981;90(3):769-777. doi:10.1083/jcb.90.3.769

Mahmud R, Rahman MM, Alam I, Ahmed KGU, Kabir AKMH, Sayeed SKJB, Rassel MA, Monayem FB, Islam MS, Islam MM, Barshan AD, Hoque MM, Mallik MU, Yusuf MA, Hossain MZ. Ivermectin in combination with doxycycline for treating COVID-19 symptoms: a randomized trial. J Int Med Res. 2021 May;49(5):3000605211013550. doi: 10.1177/03000605211013550. PMID: 33983065; PMCID: PMC8127799.

Krolewiecki A, Lifschitz A, Moragas M, Travacio M, Valentini R, Alonso DF, Solari R, Tinelli MA, Cimino RO, Álvarez L, Fleitas PE, Ceballos L, Golemba M, Fernández F, Fernández de Oliveira D, Astudillo G, Baeck I, Farina J, Cardama GA, Mangano A, Spitzer E, Gold S, Lanusse C. Antiviral effect of high-dose ivermectin in adults with COVID-19: A proof-of-concept randomized trial. EClinicalMedicine. 2021 Jun 18;37:100959. doi: 10.1016/j.eclinm.2021.100959. Erratum in: EClinicalMedicine. 2021 Sep;39:101119. PMID: 34189446; PMCID: PMC8225706.

The effect of early treatment with ivermectin on viral load, symptoms and humoral response in patients with non-severe COVID-19: A pilot, double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomized clinical trial Carlos Chaccour Aina Casellas Andrés Blanco-Di Matteo Iñigo Pineda Alejandro Fernandez-Montero Paula Ruiz-Castillo Mary-Ann Richardson Mariano Rodríguez-Mateos Carlota Jordán-Iborra Joe Brew Francisco Carmona-Torre Miriam Giráldez Ester Laso Juan C. Gabaldón-Figueira Carlota Dobaño Gemma Moncunill José R. Yuste Jose L. Del Pozo N.Regina Rabinovich Verena Schöning Felix Hammann Gabriel Reina Belen Sadaba Mirian Fernández-Alonso
Open Access Published:January 19, 2021
DOI:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2020.100720

Borm CDJM, Smilowska K, de Vries NM, Bloem BR, Theelen T. How I do it: The Neuro-Ophthalmological Assessment in Parkinson's Disease. J Parkinsons Dis. 2019;9(2):427-435. doi:10.3233/JPD-181523

1.Lide, David R., editor. CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics, 88th edition. Boca Raton, Florida: Taylor & Francis Group, 2008.
2.Yaws, Carl L. The Yaws Handbook of Physical Properties for Hydrocarbons and Chemicals. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Company, 2005.
3."Fluorine." Chemicool Periodic Table. Chemicool.com. 16 Oct. 2012. Web. 10/14/ 2020
<https:/ / www.chemicool.com/ elements/ fluorine.html>.

Jansson B. Potassium, sodium, and cancer: a review. J Environ Pathol Toxicol Oncol. 1996;15(2-4):65-73. PMID: 9216787

https://ccr.cancer.gov/news/article/high-levels-of-potassium-inside-tumors-suppressimmune activity#:~:text=Potassium%20released %20from%20dead%20tumor,tumors%20evade%20the%20body's %20defenses.

The New York Academy of Sciences (2019). National control and prevention programs for thiamine deficiency disorders: Technical Reference Materials. New York.

Thiamine deficiency and malaria in adults from southeast Asia Dr S Krishna, DPhil/ AM Taylor, PhD/ W Supanaranond, MDS/ Pukrittayakamee, Dphil/ F ter Kuile, PhD/ KM Tawfiq PAH/ Holloway, PhD/ NJ White, FRCP Published:February 13, 1999 DOI:https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-

6736(98)06316-8

Kim J, Lee JJ, Kim J, Gardner D, Beachy PA. Arsenic antagonizes the Hedgehog pathway by preventing ciliary accumulation and reducing stability of the Gli2 transcriptional effector. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2010 Jul 27;107(30):13432-7. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1006822107. Epub 2010 Jul 12. PMID: 20624968; PMCID: PMC2922148.

Borio L, Frank D, Mani V, et al. Death Due to Bioterrorism-Related Inhalational Anthrax: Report of 2 Patients. JAMA. 2001;286(20):2554–2559. doi:10.1001/jama.286.20.2554

Jeremy Sobel, Botulism, Clinical Infectious Diseases, Volume 41, Issue 8, 15 October 2005, Pages 1167–1173, https://doi.org/10.1086/ 444507

https://www.health.harvard.edu/a_to_z/plague-yersinia-pestis-a-to-z

The Apocalypse Factory: Plutonium and the Making of the Atomic Age by Steve Olson

https://medicine.iu.edu/news/2020/04/Types-of-vitamin-Econsumed-by-children-linked-to-lung-function

https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/68/wr/mm6847e1.htm

https://www.gavi.org/vaccineswork/covid-19-vaccine-race

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pfizer %E2%80%93BioNTech_COVID-19_vaccine

https://www.gavi.org/vaccineswork/there-are-four-types-covid19-vaccines-heres-how-they-work

https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/9875229/

https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/ journal.pone.0217509

Hakamifard A, Soltani R, Maghsoudi A, Rismanbaf A, Aalinezhad M, Tarrahi MJ, Mashayekhbakhsh S,
Dolatshahi K. The effect of Vitamin E and Vitamin C in patients with COVID-

**19 pneumonia; a randomized controlled clinical trial. Immunopathol Persa. 2021;7(2):e0x.
DOI:10.34172/ipp.2021.xx**

**https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/covid-19/health-departments/breakthrough-cases.html
Expression of GLUT1 in tumors promotes cancer cell survival
https://cancerres.aacrjournals.org/content/65/9_Supplement/531.4**

**(significantly higher MPV found in diabetic patients.)
https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3425267/**

**(Diabetes downregulates GLUT1 expression in the retina and its microvessels but not in the cerebral cortex or its microvessels)
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/10866055/**

**(Mean platelet volume as a possible biomarker of tumor progression in rectal cancer)
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27802192/**

http://www.ijpab.com/form/2017%20Volume%205,%20issue%206/IJPAB-2017-5-6-208-214.pdf

https://www.webmd.com/heart-disease/guide/homocysteinerisk

https://www.ahajournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1161/01.CIR.0000165142.37711.E7

**MPV-B12 corrrelation
https://jag.journalagent.com/actamedica/pdfs/ACTAMED-43434-ORIGINAL_ARTICLE-AKTAS.pdf**

**Homocysteine predicts in hospital pneumonia)
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33319686/**

**Myopericarditis complicated by pulmonary embolism in an immunocompetent patient with acute cytomegalovirus infection: a case report
https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3999874/**

https://todaysveterinarypractice.com/todays-technicianpediatric-wellness-

care-vaccine-protocols-parasitemanagement-zoonotic-disease-prevention/

https://www.aap.org/en-us/Documents/immunization_overwhelm.pdf

https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/secondshot.html

https://academic.oup.com/cid/article/40/5/683/364547

**https://academic.oup.com/ofid/article/5/10/ofy262/5139648
(CMV susceptibility)**

https://academic.oup.com/emph/article/9/1/83/6128681

**Intensive immunosuppression reduces deaths in covid-19-associated cytokine storm syndrome, study finds
BMJ 2020; 370 doi: https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m2935 (Published 22 July 2020)
https://www.bmj.com/content/370/bmj.m2935**

**Tocilizumab in Hospitalized Patients with Severe Covid-19 Pneumonia
Ivan O. Rosas, M.D., Norbert Bräu, M.D., Michael Waters, M.D., Ronaldo C. Go, M.D., Bradley D. Hunter, M.D., Sanjay Bhagani, M.D., Daniel Skiest, M.D., Mariam S. Aziz, M.D., Nichola Cooper, M.D., Ivor S. Douglas, M.D., Sinisa Savic, Ph.D., Taryn Youngstein, M.D., et al.
https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMoa2028700**

https://knowablemagazine.org/article/health-disease/2017/norovirus-perfect-pathogen

https://arstechnica.com/science/2018/04/weve-found-the-cellsnorovirus-targets-we-just-dont-know-what-they-do/

Roth AN, Karst SM. Norovirus mechanisms of immune antagonism. Curr Opin Virol. 2016;16:24-30. doi:10.1016/j.coviro.2015.11.005

Holm CK, Jensen SB, Jakobsen MR, et al. Virus-cell fusion as a trigger of innate immunity dependent on the adaptor STING. Nat Immunol. 2012;13(8):737-743. Published 2012 Jun 17. doi:10.1038/ni.2350

https://www.nature.com/articles/s41577-021-00526-x

Reversible Silencing of Cytomegalovirus Genomes by Type I Interferon Governs Virus Latency Franziska Dağ,Lars Dölken,Julia Holzki,Anja Drabig,Adrien Weingärtner,Johannes Schwerk,Stefan Lienenklaus,Ianina Conte,Robert Geffers,Colin Davenport,Ulfert Rand,Mario Köster,Siegfried Weiß, Published: February 20, 2014 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.ppat.1003962

Holm CK, Jensen SB, Jakobsen MR, et al. Virus-cell fusion as a trigger of innate immunity dependent on the adaptor STING. Nat Immunol. 2012;13(8):737-743. Published 2012 Jun 17. doi:10.1038/ni.2350

https://www.nature.com/articles/s41577-021-00526-x

https://journals.plos.org/plospathogens/article?id=10.1371/journal.ppat.1003962

https://www.hindustantimes.com/india-news/first-phase-trialof-covaxin-india-s-covid-19-vaccine-starts-on-375-people-report/story-B6PjvEIG802stUjuuYXxGJ.html

https://www.pennmedicine.org/news/news-releases/2017/october/norovirus-evades-immune-system-by-hiding-out-inrare-gut-cells

https://academic.oup.com/emph/article/9/1/83/6128681

https://www.bmj.com/content/370/bmj.m2935

https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMoa2028700

https://knowablemagazine.org/article/health-disease/2017/norovirus-perfect-pathogen

https://arstechnica.com/science/2018/04/weve-found-the-cellsnorovirus-targets-we-just-dont-know-what-they-do/

Klein JR, Raulet DH, Pasternack MS, Bevan MJ. Cytotoxic T lymphocytes produce immune interferon in response to antigen or mitogen. J Exp Med. 1982 Apr 1;155(4):1198-203. doi: 10.1084/jem.155.4.1198. PMID: 6174673; PMCID: PMC2186637.

https://portal.ct.gov/vaccine-portal/Vaccine-Knowledge-Base/Articles/mRNA-

vs-Viral-Vector?language=en_US

Changotra H, Jia Y, Moore TN, Liu G, Kahan SM, Sosnovtsev SV, Karst SM. Type I and type II interferons inhibit the translation of murine norovirus proteins. J Virol. 2009 Jun;83(11):5683-92. doi: 10.1128/JVI.00231-09. Epub 2009 Mar 18. PMID: 19297466; PMCID: PMC2681988.

Index